

R.R.
ST.3
X

Bulletin

MAY 9 - 1960

RECEIVED

MAY 10 1960

MIAMI UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

Vol. XLII, No. 1087

April 25, 1960

YEAR OF PROGRESS TOWARD PEACE • <i>Address</i> <i>by Secretary Herter</i>	635
SECRETARY HERTER'S NEWS CONFERENCE OF APRIL 8	641
UNITED STATES REPLIES TO CHILEAN STUDENTS' LETTER TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER • <i>Texts</i> <i>of U.S. and Chilean Letters</i>	648
PRESIDENT URGES LIBERALIZATION OF IMMIGRATION RESTRICTIONS • <i>Message of the President to the Congress</i>	659
CITIZENS BY CHOICE • <i>by John W. Hanes, Jr.</i>	660
SECURITY COUNCIL CALLS FOR ADHERENCE TO U.N. PRINCIPLES IN SOUTH AFRICA • <i>Statements by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge and Text of Resolution</i>	667

For index see inside back cover

HE
FFICIAL
WEEKLY RECORD
F
UNITED STATES
FOREIGN POLICY

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Bulletin

VOL. XLII, No. 1087 • PUBLICATION 6980

April 25, 1960

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

PRICE:
52 issues, domestic \$8.50, foreign \$12.25
Single copy, 25 cents

The printing of this publication has been
approved by the Director of the Bureau of
the Budget (January 20, 1958).

Note: Contents of this publication are not
copyrighted and items contained herein may
be reprinted. Citation of the DEPARTMENT
OF STATE BULLETIN as the source will be
appreciated.

*The Department of State BULLETIN,
a weekly publication issued by the
Office of Public Services, Bureau of
Public Affairs, provides the public
and interested agencies of the
Government with information on de-
velopments in the field of foreign rela-
tions and on the work of the Depart-
ment of State and the Foreign Service.
The BULLETIN includes selected press
releases on foreign policy, issued by
the White House and the Department,
and statements and addresses made
by the President and by the Secretary
of State and other officers of the De-
partment, as well as special articles on
various phases of international affairs
and the functions of the Department.
Information is included concerning
treaties and international agreements
to which the United States is or may
become a party and treaties of general
international interest.*

*Publications of the Department,
United Nations documents, and leg-
islative material in the field of inter-
national relations are listed currently.*

Year of Progress Toward Peace

Address by Secretary Herter¹

Radio and television serve the United States well in informing the American people of the objectives and development of our foreign policy. We also make very extensive use of radio and TV in our effort to increase understanding of this country on the part of peoples abroad. The consistent high level of cooperation which has been given us by American commercial broadcasters is most gratifying.

The television industry overseas is now undergoing the same great expansion it saw in this country 5 or 6 years ago. The United States Information Agency is equipping itself to make full use of the TV medium to increase world understanding of this country. I have every confidence that we will enjoy from the television industry the same generous and useful cooperation which has been extended by the radio broadcasters, so that the world can see us more clearly as we are.

We also know of the fine cooperation that the broadcasters have given and continue to give to private organizations such as the Crusade for Freedom.

Here also I want to record with thanks the generous support we always enjoyed from the late Harold Fellows, your president. His ability was matched by his patriotic willingness to serve, and we share your sorrow at his loss.

It is now almost a year since I took office as Secretary of State. Therefore I should like to review the main trends of American foreign policy and to express some thoughts on what lies ahead.

¹Made at the 38th annual convention of the National Association of Broadcasters at Chicago, Ill., on Apr. 4 (press release 167).

The primary purpose of United States policy is to safeguard the freedom and security of the American people. To do this in today's world we must solve a problem that mankind has not yet been able to master: the problem of peaceful change. We must prevent the use of military force to accomplish change, and devise means of achieving needed change in peaceful ways.

The United States seeks to reduce the possibility of violent action, and to assure that needed adjustments will be peacefully made, in five principal ways:

One: We strengthen the collective security arrangements that deter aggression.

Two: We strive for agreement on arms control measures which would reduce the risk of war.

Three: We are negotiating with the Soviet Union to promote the settlement of political issues which divide us.

Four: We are strengthening our program for helping the less developed countries to achieve needed progress.

And five: We support the United Nations in efforts to promote the orderly solution of problems, thus reducing the chance of conflict.

Collective Security

If the use of force was deterred in Europe last year over the question of Berlin, and in the Far East in connection with Formosa and the Kingdom of Laos, it was in part because of free-world defensive might and a clear evidence of readiness to apply that might if necessary. This strength has been confirmed and increased by recent steps including the signing of a new security treaty between the United States and Japan,² improved

²For text, see BULLETIN of Feb. 8, 1960, p. 184.

coordination and cooperation in SEATO [South-east Asia Treaty Organization] and CENTO [Central Treaty Organization], and the strengthening of the inter-American system through the Foreign Ministers Meeting in Santiago.³

The first bulwark created in our system of collective security was the North Atlantic Alliance, which celebrates its 11th anniversary today.

In dealing with such major issues as disarmament, the future of Germany, and the freedom of Berlin, the cohesion of the North Atlantic Alliance has been strengthened and made manifest through consultation and cooperation in the North Atlantic Council. Never before in history has there been in time of peace a system for political consultation among sovereign nations so successful as the one we have in NATO today.

Even with the increasing contribution of the alliance to the development of new habits of cooperation among like-minded peoples, the military strength of NATO remains the core of its existence, essential to the Western negotiating position.

This military strength continues to grow. German defensive rearment is proceeding satisfactorily and is devoted entirely to the obligations for collective self-defense assumed by the Federal Republic in NATO. A number of European NATO countries have decided or are planning to increase their defense budgets. The presence of American forces on the continent of Europe, alongside those of the United Kingdom and Canada, is visible evidence of our recognition that American security is inseparable from the security of Western Europe. And great progress is being made in equipping the American and European forces of the NATO shield with the modern weapons which will be essential to the security of the treaty area until dependable, controlled disarmament has been achieved.

But even though progress has been substantial, important tasks remain ahead. The ground, sea, and air forces of NATO require still further strengthening. We and our allies seek also to promote further growth within NATO of cooperation and consultation vital to the continued well-being of the Atlantic Community and essential in this age of interdependence.

³ For background, see *ibid.*, Aug. 31, 1959, p. 299, and Sept. 7, 1959, p. 342.

The United States will continue to move forward with its NATO partners in meeting both military and nonmilitary objectives. It was my privilege to propose at the North Atlantic Council Ministerial Meeting last December⁴ a program of long-range NATO planning for the period of the 1960's. The Council adopted that proposal, and this country will work closely with the other members in promoting its success.

As the world enters on an era when the threat of overt aggression may appear to recede, there might be a temptation to take NATO and other collective security arrangements for granted, to assume that the priority of policy lies elsewhere. I cannot overemphasize that in future years as in the past—until controlled general disarmament is achieved—and an international peace force established—the military strength of NATO and our other collective arrangements will remain a cornerstone of this country's policy, an essential foundation of a just peace.

Arms Control

While working to deter aggression through collective security, the United States also seeks to reduce the risk of war and the burden of armaments expenditures through safeguarded arms control.

In the short run, agreements to control arms could reduce the chance that war would be caused by miscalculation. They could also help to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons into irresponsible hands.

In the long run, the Western nations hope gradually to obtain the universal adoption of a more adequate body of international law, and machinery for its enforcement. Within this framework it would then be possible to undertake more general disarmament.

To fulfill our short-run goal the United States and the United Kingdom have over the past 17 months negotiated steadily with the Soviet Union for a discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests. Such a test suspension would not only inhibit the spread of nuclear weapons and allay worldwide concern over fallout but would set an important control precedent for the vaster problem of disarmament.

⁴ For texts of communique issued by the North Atlantic Council, see *ibid.*, Jan. 4, 1960, p. 3, and Jan. 11, 1960, p. 44.

Significant progress has now been achieved in bringing the Soviet and Western positions on testing closer together. Last week President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan made a proposal⁵ which opens the possibility of a great forward stride toward the desired objective of a controlled, comprehensive cessation of all nuclear weapons tests. If this proposal is accepted, it would mean that a safeguarded treaty could be reached which would halt tests in the atmosphere, in the oceans, and in the higher altitudes, and under ground for large explosions, and bring into effect a temporary voluntary moratorium on small tests which we believe cannot now be reliably detected and identified.

By this joint response the United States and the United Kingdom have brought within reach an agreement which could well be a historic turning point in the quest for the agreed arms control measures which would lead to a far greater degree of international peace and security.

Now it is up to the Soviet Union. It is their move.

The developments in the Geneva test-ban negotiations are of extreme importance; but our larger objective is general, controlled arms limitations.

Last month the Allied Powers presented to the Ten-Nation Disarmament Conference a three-phase safeguarded arms reduction program which would lead to the goal of general disarmament.⁶ It is our conviction that this program offers a feasible, practical approach, whereas the broad and vague provisions of the Soviet proposal have not so far demonstrated their practicality.

The first and second phases of the Western program include proposals which would promote our short-run goal of reducing the risk of unintended war. Proposals in this phase include advance notification of the launching of objects into outer space and other safeguards against surprise attack. We also propose cutoff of production of fissionable materials for weapons purposes, which would check the spread of nuclear weapons.

The third phase of the Western program would fulfill our ultimate goal of general disarmament. It provides for very drastic reductions in armed forces and for a parallel buildup of machinery for effective enforcement of international law.

⁵ For text, see *ibid.*, Apr. 18, 1960, p. 587.

⁶ For text, see *ibid.*, Apr. 4, 1960, p. 511.

Progress toward these goals will require an increasing readiness on the part of the Soviet leadership to accept the practical step essential to effective arms limitation.

Nuclear destruction is no respecter of nationality. There is no ideological coloration to survival. The hunger of peoples to devote their resources to economic development and social advancement, rather than the production of arms, is the monopoly of neither side. Genuine progress toward safeguarded arms control would promote the best interests of both sides, without sacrifice of position or principle by either.

Reaching any sort of agreement will not be easy. But it is necessary, more necessary each day. And as Secretary Dulles used to say, "We must accept as our working hypothesis that what is necessary is possible."

Political Negotiation

We are earnestly seeking to reduce the risk of war by negotiating with the Soviet Union about political disputes as well as arms control.

Our immediate goal in these continuing negotiations is to clarify the positions of both sides and to reduce the danger of conflict over the political issues that divide us.

Our long-term objective is to lay the basis for eventual resolution of these issues.

Clearly, one of the key issues before us is the problem of the division of Germany. Not only does this unnatural division represent a grave injustice to the German people, but, what is equally serious, the continued division of Germany, if not resolved, will inevitably result in jeopardizing the peace of the world.

In recent months Mr. Khrushchev has repeatedly suggested in public statements that, if the Western Powers do not agree to settle the German problem on his terms, he may proceed unilaterally to conclude a separate treaty with the East German regime. While he has been careful not to be too precise in his statements on this subject, the repetition of this threat cannot help but complicate the situation and affect adversely the international atmosphere.

Mr. Khrushchev has also said recently in reference to Asia that "every people has the right of self-determination." But it is clear from the Soviet record with respect to Germany that Mr. Khrushchev is not prepared to see this principle

applied in the case of the 17 million people under Communist control in East Berlin and East Germany.

The Western Powers, by contrast, through a long series of postwar negotiations, have insisted that the principle of self-determination be honored. More specifically, we believe that reunification should be achieved on the basis of free plebiscites and that a final peace settlement should be concluded with the German government formed on the basis of such plebiscites.

The Berlin question can also be expected to figure prominently in the forthcoming Paris Heads of Government discussions. The division of Berlin is but a reflection of the larger problem of the division of Germany.

In the coming summit conference the Western Powers are determined to protect the freedom and security of the people of West Berlin. We made this position clear at the Foreign Ministers Conference at Geneva.⁷ President Eisenhower reaffirmed it at Camp David.⁸ We and our allies agreed as recently as the Heads of Government meeting at Paris in December⁹ to continue to stand firm on West Berlin. In thus making sure that the Soviet leaders do not misjudge our firmness, we reduce the chances of rash action which would greatly increase tensions.

While reaffirming our fundamental rights and responsibilities with respect to Berlin, we are sincerely willing to enter into negotiations to solve this problem in the context of the German problem as a whole.

While I am discussing the German problem I should like to take this opportunity to say a few words about the new Germany—the Federal Republic of Germany. I have noted in recent months many hostile attacks of Soviet origin, some from Mr. Khrushchev himself, labeling the Government of the Federal Republic as "militaristic." These charges are completely without foundation.

⁷ For a statement by Secretary Herter at the closing session on Aug. 5, together with texts of a Four Power communique and a declaration on disarmament, see *ibid.*, Aug. 24, 1959, p. 265.

⁸ For text of a joint communique issued at Camp David following talks between President Eisenhower and Nikita S. Khrushchev, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., see *ibid.*, Oct. 12, 1959, p. 499.

⁹ *Ibid.*, Jan. 11, 1960, p. 43.

They are clearly designed not only to discredit Chancellor Adenauer's government but also to sow the seeds of suspicion and disunity among the members of the free-world alliance. During the first decade of its existence the Federal Republic, under the constructive leadership of Chancellor Adenauer, has reestablished in Germany a democratic order dedicated to the principles of freedom and justice. Within the framework of such arrangements as the European Community and NATO, both of which have received unstinting German support, the Federal Republic has effectively contributed to the development of political and economic stability in Western Europe and to the maintenance of free-world security. It has proved itself in every way a worthy and respected ally.

At the summit meeting next month in Paris the West will continue to make clear the free world's determination to defend essential rights. At the same time it will continue to seek to explore all avenues, particularly arms control, which would reduce the risk of war.

We can hardly move forward confidently in negotiating new arms control agreements with the Soviet Union, however, if our existing agreements with them about Berlin are meanwhile being violated or threatened with violations. There is a clear relation between these two crucial issues.

Three Western Foreign Ministers meetings at Washington, at Istanbul, and at Paris will precede the summit conference, providing opportunity for reviewing the preparatory work undertaken in working groups and for consulting and coordinating views. On the basis of these preparations we and our allies will work at the summit to reduce the degree of misunderstanding between the Soviet Union and ourselves and the chance of Soviet miscalculation of our strength or our intentions. We will strive to make progress toward practical working agreements in areas of greatest danger. And we will explore carefully the possibility of future negotiation.

These, of course, are limited purposes. If anyone looks for dramatic achievements at the summit, he may be disappointed. But if the Western allies stand firm by their beliefs and commitments, while they pursue steadily the aim of preventing the East-West contest from exploding into war, then we can and we do hope for progress.

Less Developed Areas

Efforts to deter the use of force through collective security arrangements and to temper unresolved issues through negotiation will not alone insure peace. We must seek also to promote constructive and peaceful change in areas where it is needed.

If the countries of Africa and Asia cannot attain the progress they seek through orderly methods, then despair will surely generate the seeds of conflict. It is in our vital interest that they should grow in freedom and gain in strength.

This country's Mutual Security Program helps them do just that. This program requires each year less than 1 percent of America's gross national product. Yet without it the great Afro-Asian arc, with its vast populations and resources, could perhaps not be saved from the announced intentions of Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Mao Tse-tung to conquer the world by all means short of war.

Increasingly we are seeking to provide funds for economic development not as gifts but as loans. The President's current request to the Congress for \$700 million in new capital for the Development Loan Fund¹⁰ is an important step to this end. These resources are needed if the Fund is to play its part as a key instrument of United States development financing abroad.

In the period ahead the United States will seek increasingly to concentrate our development financing in countries which have shown the capacity for determined, disciplined self-help. Thus concentrating our efforts demonstrates to all the growing nations that rapid growth can be achieved under conditions of freedom. It also provides incentive for those nations which seek outside help to demonstrate that they are willing and ready to help themselves. And it forwards the time when the nations we assist will, in turn, be able to provide help to their neighbors.

The industrialized nations of Western Europe and Japan, because of the improvement in their economic condition which our aid helped them bring about, are now increasingly able and willing to help the developing nations. This is a major

¹⁰ For text, see *ibid.*, Mar. 7, 1960, p. 369; for statements by Secretary Herter, Under Secretary Dillon, and International Cooperation Administration Director James W. Riddleberger, see *ibid.*, Apr. 11, 1960, p. 566.

demonstration of the present and future dividends of past economic assistance.

The energies of private enterprise should increasingly be mobilized for the development task. Your Government continually searches for means by which this great resource can make its full contribution to free-world growth, stability, and strength.

In addition to offering assistance, this country seeks to build a bridge of understanding to the emerging nations. The most important and dramatic steps of recent years to this end have been the good-will trips of President Eisenhower to Asia and Latin America.¹¹ These trips have dramatized and increased the vast reservoir of good will toward the United States which exists in those areas. They have released a welcome outpouring of latent friendship toward the United States.

The United States is making particular efforts to build closer relations with the new African nations. The welfare and security of these peoples is of very great concern to us, as they assume the responsibilities of independence. It is our hope that they can devise regional arrangements to insure the peaceful settlement of disputes and to avoid a wasteful and dangerous arms race. This would indeed be a forward step toward insuring peaceful change.

Progress Toward World Order

Great demands have been made, and will continue to be made, upon the United States by the recurring stresses of a world of change. Necessary as are the contributions of individual nations, however, there is no substitute for the work of international organizations if this process of change is to remain within peaceful limits. The contributions of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, as well as the Organization of American States and the Colombo Plan, are also needed.

Great demands have been made on the United Nations, and increasingly it has met them. In the process it has grown. The authority of the

¹¹ President Eisenhower visited 11 countries in Europe, the Middle East, South Asia, and Africa Dec. 3-22; for background, see *ibid.*, Dec. 28, 1959, p. 931, and Jan. 11, 1960, p. 46. On Mar. 7 he returned from a 2-week trip to 4 countries in Latin America; for background, see *ibid.*, Mar. 28, 1960, p. 471.

office of the Secretary-General has been strengthened. The concept of the United Nations Emergency Force has been tested successfully. In various crises what might be described as the "fire-fighting" equipment of the United Nations has undergone organic growth through meeting the demands made upon it. In addition the General Assembly has continued to serve as a town meeting—a safety valve—for the world.

The United States will assist continuing progress along these lines. We will support Secretary-General Hammarskjold's efforts to create standby arrangements for United Nations forces or other forms of United Nations presence which may be needed in troubled areas. We will consult about such measures at the next session of the United Nations.

Our proposal to the Ten-Nation Disarmament Conference, that the gradual development of a more adequate body and machinery of international law and enforcement should accompany, and thereby make possible, a general reduction in world armaments, reflects our hopes for and our faith in the United Nations.

The proposal for an international police force is a major difference between our disarmament proposal and that of the Soviet Union. Small nations in particular have a vital interest in this difference. General disarmament as proposed by the Soviet Union would leave these nations even more defenseless than before, in the face of the substantial forces that their larger neighbors would be allowed to retain for internal security.

The development of an international peace force is provided by the United Nations Charter. All the nations that are members of the United Nations subscribed to this idea when they assumed the obligations of membership. The Soviet Union, however, by repeated use of the veto, has prevented any progress toward its realization. We shall continue to press for measures which will make this part of the charter a living reality.

The Future

I do not claim that the performance of the United States in all these fields of foreign policy has necessarily been perfect. Yet I do assert that we have made substantial—I say significant—progress in our main lines of effort.

Formidable obstacles remain. But the efforts

are well launched; the free nations know where they are going. And we have every intention of continuing to move toward our goal of peace with justice and progress.

The outcome will depend on the strength and unity of the free world. The more unmistakable our strength, moral and physical, and the more pronounced our unity, national and international, the less likely there will be serious danger of war.

As long as the military and economic elements of our strength are equal to our task—and they are and will continue to be—the rest will depend on our courage, our determination, our dedication to the values and purposes of free men.

We might do well to recall the words of a great American, Theodore Roosevelt, who said more than half a century ago: "The Twentieth Century looms before us big with the fate of many nations. If we stand idly by . . . if we shrink from the hard contests which men must win at hazard of their lives and the risk of all that they hold dear, then the bolder and stronger peoples will win . . . for themselves the domination of the world."

I know that our will and courage will meet the tests of the coming months, and those that lie beyond.

King and Queen of Nepal To Visit United States

The Department of State announced on April 4 (press release 169) that arrangements had been completed for the visit of His Majesty Mahendra Bir Bikram Shah Deva, King of Nepal, who will visit the United States this spring at the invitation of President Eisenhower. His Majesty will be accompanied by Her Majesty Ratna Rajya Lakshmi Shah, Queen of Nepal.

Their Majesties and party will arrive at Washington on April 27 and will remain in the Capital until April 30, when they will leave for a month's tour of the United States that will include visits to Fort Bragg, N.C., New York City, the Tennessee Valley Authority, Rochester, Minn., Salem and Eugene, Oreg., San Francisco, Monterey, and Los Angeles, Calif., Yosemite National Park, the Hoover Dam, the Grand Canyon, Albuquerque, N. Mex., Dallas, Tex., Miami, Fla., and Detroit, Mich.

Secretary Herter's News Conference of April 8

Press release 179 dated April 8

Secretary Herter: I have no preliminary statement to make.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you will be meeting here next week with the foreign ministers of some of the other Western countries on preparations for the summit conference. Could you tell us at this time what you expect will be accomplished at these meetings next week here?

A. Yes. We are having a number of separate meetings. We are having one meeting of the British and French and ourselves, and then we are having a meeting of the British and the French and the Germans, and then a meeting of the five foreign ministers of the countries that are represented at the Disarmament Committee, and then we are having a meeting on the following day of the three and Mr. Spaak [Paul-Henri Spaak, Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization]. And in those meetings we will be reviewing the work of the preparatory commissions or the working groups that have been studying possible questions that will arise at the summit meeting. This is only one of a series of meetings with the foreign ministers. We expect another one at Istanbul at the time of the NATO meeting early in May and another one probably just preceding the summit meeting itself in Paris in the middle of May.

Q. Mr. Secretary, are you confident that at this series of meetings held in Washington you will reach a united front among the allies on the questions of disarmament, Berlin, and the future of Germany?

A. I can't anticipate whether we will reach agreement. I think that our positions will become very much better known to each other. I am hopeful that we will reach agreement, but we

are providing for these additional meetings so that if there is more work to be done by the working parties, if there are further questions we would want to study with our principals, we will have the succeeding meetings in the expectation that our positions will have been clarified and united before the summit meeting.

Q. Mr. Secretary, has the preparatory work gone far enough now so that it is possible to say what subject will have priority at the summit conference?

A. No. It is hard to say what subjects will have priority. From the preliminary talks as indicated by the De Gaulle-Khrushchev talks, it looks as though disarmament might have the first priority. But we are anticipating, of course, that the German problem and the related problem of Berlin will be raised at a given time. Possibly some phases of the nuclear testing may be raised at the summit conference. And we just don't know what other questions may come up.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you have often said that you don't have high hopes for the summit conference on the Western side. Do you have any idea what the Russians hope to accomplish at the summit conference?

A. No. That would be purely speculation. I don't know.

Q. Mr. Secretary, it has been attributed to you the thought of proposing to the Russians that we agree to the separation of Germany if it is confirmed by a plebiscite of the East Germans. Is this an idea that you have put forward?

A. Well, I don't think I have ever put it forward in exactly those terms. I think that I have on numerous occasions expressed my personal view that the right of self-determination is an inherent right, that the question of the future of

East Germany as well as of Berlin should be in accord with the determination made by the people themselves in properly supervised elections.

Nuclear Testing

Q. Mr. Secretary, for some time it has been the position of the United States that we would not accept a ban on nuclear testing in areas where we could not control or supervise. As recently as February 11 our spokesman at Geneva, according to this release today by the Department,¹ said that the United States cannot agree to a prohibition of testing in areas where controls cannot be effectively maintained. A consequence of the visit of the Prime Minister of Great Britain² is that we are now on record as being willing to accept a temporary moratorium on testing in an area that we cannot control or inspect. Could you explain this change in position?

A. Yes. There is no change in position. The treaty itself on which we have been working now for some 17 months will provide a ban—which means for all time—a ban on all forms of testing in the air, under water, and under ground where adequate inspection could be performed. Having found that in the lower reaches for small explosions underground instrumentation is not sufficiently sensitive at the present time to guarantee that that type of test can be detected, the present proposal that we have made is that we would have a temporary moratorium while research was being done in order to try to improve the instrumentation so that eventually the inspection could be made on all types of underground tests.

Q. Mr. Secretary, at his press conference last week the President suggested that at Geneva it might be possible to arrive at agreement on the number of on-site inspections both above and below the threshold as a political determination. Previously you have always insisted that this must be on the basis of a scientific determination. Does this represent a change in policy?

A. No, it doesn't represent a change in policy either. When you speak of a political determina-

¹ On Apr. 8 the Département of State released as an unnumbered press release various materials summarizing statements and subsequent clarifications of the U.S. proposal of Feb. 11 and the Soviet proposal of Mar. 19 at the Geneva Conference on the Discontinuance of Nuclear Weapons Tests.

² BULLETIN of Apr. 18, 1960, p. 587.

tion, it all depends on how your mind has been working in formulating that political determination. We have always taken the position that the number of on-site inspections should be related to the probable number of unidentifiable events that took place within a given range. Any political decision we might make would still be made with that in mind. The Russians on the other hand have taken the position that this is a purely arbitrary political decision unrelated to the scientific fact. We have never agreed to that. You may say that it is a political decision if the decision as to a difference between an x number and an x other number is made by individuals at the summit. But it would be, as far as we are concerned, a decision motivated by a relationship between the number of inspections and the number of unidentifiable events. I might say that Mr. [Semyon] Tsarapkin, speaking on behalf of the Soviets in Geneva, has gone so far as to say that this decision is one that he himself cannot make. It must be made at a higher level.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on that point, beneath the threshold of 4.75, our scientists estimate that there would be something like 5,000 to 28,000 events per year. What sort of relationship do we see between that number of events which we might have to inspect and the number of events on which on-site inspections might be necessary below the threshold?

A. We have not made any fixed determination on that. Again a great deal depends on the sensitivity of the instrumentation. It is possible that with further experimentation the scientists will be able to find a real distinction in the signals accepted by seismic machines which would indicate a variation between the manmade explosion and the natural earthquake. If that should happen, and we think that it probably can happen in the higher ranges at least, then the number of suspicious events would be reduced very considerably beyond the number of total earthquakes or tremors which would take place around the world.

Q. Which higher levels, sir, did you mean? Below the threshold or above the threshold?

A. Above the threshold. Above the threshold there are far fewer events than there would be below.

Q. Mr. Secretary, we understand there has been

no decision as yet as to how many or what a minimum number of inspections would be?

A. No.

Q. And you are going into the summit conference without such a decision?

A. There is a direct relation between that and the number of inspection stations within the country itself that are set up, how far apart they are, whether in addition to those there are unmanned stations that extend the number of seismic machines to closer and closer intervals. In other words, there are a number of factors still to be determined in connection with that.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there have been reports in the past few days that General de Gaulle has told the British that Premier Khrushchev has made it clear that he does not intend to press the Berlin picture to the point of crisis at the summit conference. Have we been given any such fill-in, and do you have any reason for believing that this might be so?

A. No, we have no specific information on that point.

Q. Mr. Secretary, in relation to that, in your speech the other day in Chicago³ you did touch on another aspect of it. Would you feel that a major clash at the summit on the Berlin issue would probably preclude any progress on the nuclear test ban?

A. I think it might prejudice further progress in that direction very materially.

Question of Sovereignty In Outer Space

Q. Mr. Secretary, on another aspect, there is a satellite whirling around the globe now taking pictures of the earth. Is it a fact that as of now in the period since the first satellites were launched there has been no nation in the world which has made any diplomatic protests about a violation of sovereignty by these instruments? And, if that is so, do you consider that the fact has now been established that there is no sovereignty in the area of space?

A. You are quite correct in saying that there has been no protest by any nation that this is a violation of its upper reaches, that sovereignty

carries on ad infinitum up to the heavens somewhere. That is quite correct. The whole question of law governing outer space has been given quite a little consideration. We are hoping that someday there will be, and there will probably have to be, specific international laws adopted by the nations in order to at least regularize the traffic that may appear in outer space, but this will probably be a slow-moving thing.

Q. Well, can I ask a second question about this? Now that we have gotten into the picture-taking business, which has obvious possible military intelligence possibilities, once it has been refined, which one assumes it will be, is it our position that we have a right to launch satellites that could take any kind of picture that we are technically capable of taking over any country and that contrariwise that any country has that right over our territory?

A. I don't think that that has been determined as an issue at all. As I understand the present satellite, it was launched for meteorological purposes, and that that was its sole objective, and that all of its findings are being made available to the scientific world, and that it may be a very useful thing from the point of view of future meteorological studies and weather predictions and so on. With respect to the taking of photographs all over the world, I don't think that that has been a matter of international discussion in any form as yet.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on that same point, would you as Secretary of State have any objection to put forward in the National Security Council, for example, on this matter of the kind of activity that satellites were engaged in?

A. I would doubt it.

Q. Mr. Secretary, there has been a lot of discussion back and forth across the Atlantic recently about what went on between you, Mr. Dillon, and Mr. Macmillan on the question of Sixes and Sevens.⁴ Can you fill us in?

A. No. I think that Mr. Macmillan has done that pretty adequately when he got back to Great Britain. I think that he felt that some of the

³ See p. 635.
⁴ The European Economic Community, the "Inner Six," is composed of Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands. The European Free Trade Association, the "Outer Seven," is composed of Austria, Denmark, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom.

alleged conversations that had taken place were not accurately reported, and I think he has straightened out the record in that respect. I think that is sufficient.

Q. Mr. Secretary, to go back to the picture-taking satellite, the space agency today announced that one of the cameras failed, that apparently it didn't take pictures over the Iron Curtain countries but apparently it did take pictures over the free world. Do you have any verification of that?

A. No. I have no verification of that. I think the only pictures that I have seen—and I saw them before they were published—were the same ones that were published.

Q. Mr. Secretary, another question on that, has the State Department asked the space agency or any other agency of the Government not to release any pictures on any diplomatic or security grounds?

A. No, I don't think we have made any such request.

Q. Mr. Secretary, have you any comment upon the Polish-Cuban aid agreement that was announced last Friday?

A. Yes, to this extent. There were reports that that agreement included the furnishing to the Cubans of some material of war. When the Deputy Prime Minister came in to see me 2 days ago,⁵ I inquired about that and he gave me every assurance—and I think he made a public statement afterward—to the effect that nothing in that trade agreement could be construed as conveying to the Cubans anything of a warlike nature.

Q. Mr. Secretary, when Ambassador [Henry Cabot] Lodge voted in the United Nations to deplore the actions of South Africa,⁶ he made the distinction quite carefully that in South Africa apartheid is government policy, whereas the national policy of the United States was nothing like that. However, if some other government should not choose to see it quite that way and ask for a discussion in the United Nations, in the Security Council perhaps, of any difficulties of that sort in the United States, would we veto it?

A. Well, as you know, in connection with that type of question, we have interpreted the charter

of the United Nations very liberally and we have voted to inscribe certain matters for discussion on the ground that discussion would be helpful rather than harmful, matters that other nations have objected to as being of purely domestic concern. That has been a matter of interpretation and of tactics. Obviously, if something occurred in this country that endangered the peace of the world, as this resolution was drafted to convey that meaning, or that appeared to be a deliberate violation by our Government of human rights, I think we would have to—we couldn't protest if it were inscribed. But I think that Mr. Lodge made it very clear that insofar as the United States was concerned, the Government was making every effort and had continuously made every effort to respect human rights, that our whole system of government was based on that, that where we had had some difficulty was with law, and with enforcement of law, but that the attitude of the Government was entirely different from that of the *apartheid*, which deliberately promoted a complete segregation of the races.

Q. Sir, following up that question, have you discussed this with Senator [J. W.] Fulbright, and are these his views as well?

A. No, I haven't discussed it with Senator Fulbright.

Q. Mr. Secretary, could you give us an appraisal of your visit with the Colombian President this week?

A. Well, I think that there will be quite a lengthy communique given out at the White House, both by the White House and by himself, this afternoon. It has been a very pleasant relationship, a very fruitful one. He is a man of very great distinction, one highly respected as a statesman throughout the Latin American world, and our conversations I think have been very beneficial.

The Cuban Question

Q. Mr. Secretary, a couple of weeks ago in an interview with Senator [Leverett] Saltonstall in response to a question, you said that it would not be correct, you thought, to describe the Cuban Government as Communist but that it did seem that some of the high officials were Communist sympathizers. I am wondering if you would care to elaborate on that in any way and if you could

⁵ BULLETIN of Apr. 11, 1960, p. 557.

⁶ See p. 667.

have
on
n
ther
have
cern.
d of
this
world,
ean-
tion
k we
ere
le it
was
very
t to
n of
had
en-
the
t of
om-

you
and

tor

ap-
ent

e a
uite
self,
la-
very
es-
nd
ery

an
in
not
an
em
ist
re
ld

in

give us another progress report on our relations with Cuba. Are they better, worse, or what?

A. Well, if I had to give you a progress report, I couldn't honestly say that they were better, since Ambassador [Philip W.] Bonsal's return. With regard to the Communist side of the picture, there is one very disturbing development that is taking place in Cuba and that is that anticomunism is now being made synonymous with antirevolution, and that those who express concern about Communist influence are now being accused of being antirevolution and anti-Castro. And this is obviously an effort to stop any anti-Communist criticism that might arise within the country itself.

Q. Mr. Secretary, did I understand you to say before that we might be considering a proposal to supplement the 180-station network for controlling a nuclear test ban with unmanned stations? Is that a possibility before the summit?

A. That is a possibility. As you may recall, in one of the scientific reports that we received it was indicated that this is something that ought to be developed. We are studying the matter very carefully now. We did reach agreement with the Russians before that the control commission would have authority to install the most up-to-date equipment and perfect it as science made such perfection possible. We are hopeful that we may know more about this particular method of extending the control system in the very near future.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on the Cuban question again, there was a statement by the Department some time back referring to Cuban statements that they might withdraw or renounce, rather, the Rio Pact and the other resolution. Have we taken any action on this? This was under study. What is our position now on this?

A. This is a matter which is still under study. It's under study not only by ourselves, but I think that all the Latin American countries are very much interested in that particular statement. There has been an allegation that Prime Minister Fidel Castro was misquoted on that. But as far as we know, the original statement still stands, and as it was relayed to us, it was relayed in the original language in exactly the form in which it was delivered, and that made it very clear that he at least considered that the Rio Pact was not

binding upon him and upon Cuba because the revolutionary government had not signed it. This, of course, was a very sweeping statement which might well imply that any treaty of any kind with regard to Cuba was not binding because it had not been signed by the revolutionary government.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on that same point, the Cuban radio said 2 days ago that Premier Castro had also denounced the Caracas Declaration.⁸ Is there any intention of the United States or other members of the Organization of American States in bringing this to the attention of the OAS?

A. I think it is being considered by the OAS. The Caracas resolution, of course, was very different from the Rio Pact. The Caracas resolution was merely one in which the countries bound themselves to consult in the event of the intervention of international communism in any of their countries. The Rio Treaty goes much farther than that in that the Rio Treaty is the treaty which provides that an attack on one is an attack on all. That is the treaty of alliance among all the Latin American states.

Q. But in view of what you have just said, Mr. Secretary, about the significance of their saying that to be anti-Communist is to be anti-revolution, do we think that it is significant that

⁸ On Mar. 30 Lincoln White, Director of the Office of News, read to news correspondents the following statement:

"Confirmed reports indicate that in a television interview on March 28 the Prime Minister of Cuba, Dr. Fidel Castro, stated and repeated for emphasis that his government does not regard itself as obligated by the Pact of Rio de Janeiro because the 'Revolution did not sign that Pact.' It would be difficult to overstate the amazement and concern with which we view this statement. We believe this concern will be shared by all other members of the Organization of American States. The solemn obligations of a treaty fully accepted by all members of the inter-American community are not so easily avoided. These obligations as well as the advantages of protection which all parties to the treaty, including Cuba, enjoy are an integral part of one of the basic instruments of the inter-American system. It should also be pointed out that the attitude toward these obligations expressed by the Prime Minister on March 28 is contrary to the assurances given by the Cuban Government upon its assumption of power in 1959 and by the Prime Minister himself when he visited the United States in April of last year."

* For text, see BULLETIN of Apr. 26, 1954, p. 638.

they should have denounced the Caracas Declaration as well?

A. Yes, I think it undoubtedly is. Yet you run into these contradictory statements; for example, Raúl Castro made a statement in regard to Guantanamo, saying that they have a treaty with the United States and intend to respect the treaty.

Q. Mr. Secretary, you said that one of the disturbing developments in Cuba was that anticomunism was being made synonymous with the antirevolution and anti-Castroism. Who is doing this? Is this being done with the active support and aid of some of the Cuban Government officials?

A. Yes, I think very definitely.

Q. Sir, since Ambassador Bonsal has returned to Habana, has he seen Prime Minister Castro and does he have any intention of seeking such an interview?

A. I think that he has been very hampered in moving in that the Minister of Foreign Affairs has been quite ill and he has had quite great difficulty in seeing him. Castro himself, I don't think he has seen him.

Q. Has he seen the Minister of Foreign Affairs, sir?

A. Yes, he saw him once only but only for a short time. The Minister of Foreign Affairs has been ill, and quite ill. I don't think it's a diplomatic illness.

Q. He does intend to seek an interview with Castro, doesn't he?

A. I don't know at what stage of the game. I think normally he would be conducting his affairs with the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Disarmament Conference

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you have any preliminary comments on the proposal made in the 10-nation talks in Geneva today for another form of 4-year plan for complete and total disarmament? And if it is too early for you to comment on that, sir, do you have any general views on those 10-nation talks?

A. I know very little about this new proposal. I must say on the first reading of it I was quite struck by the statement—to whom it should be

attributed I don't know—but this was the same salad with more Russian dressing. But it appears to be the original proposal just put in different words, and as far as I can make out this is a semantic argument that is still going on.

Q. Well, Mr. Secretary, on the test-ban issue again, at the time you finished the talks with the British here there was some uncertainty about whether the President could commit himself beyond the end of his term on this unilateral moratorium. Since then all, or practically all, of the Democratic presidential candidates have indicated a willingness to have such a commitment made, and one assumes that the Vice President is agreeable. Does this mean that there is now a possibility that the United States might consider offering a longer period?

A. Well, there again just what form that might take I can't say. I think that the President's limitations still exist. I think that what has been said by these candidates might well lead one to believe that they would be willing to carry on for a longer period of time while the scientific research is being done. But from the point of view of his legal ability to bind the United States for a longer period of time, I think that still remains within his own term.

Q. Do you know whether the President got the ruling that he mentioned last week he was going to ask for from the Attorney General?

A. No, I can't say.

Q. Mr. Secretary, Communist China has been making a number of very strong statements to the effect that the United States will never abandon war and that on the part of the Socialist or Communist countries they must increase their struggle for what they call peace. This line is in sharp contrast to the talk of Premier Khrushchev. What allowances or what preparations are you making for this kind of situation in preparing for the summit and for your disarmament talks?

A. Well, I think, as I made clear before, if with the Russians we can reach a certain point with regard to disarmament or with regard to the cessation of nuclear testing, that at some given point the adherence of the Chinese to a similar self-denying ordinance or treaty will become a very important matter. The Chinese at the present time are taking a very different line from the

same
appears
ferent
a se-

issue
with the
about
lf be-
mora-
of the
cated
made,
agree-
possi-
sider

night
udent's
been
ne to
on for
ic re-
view
es for
ains

ot the
going

been
to the
ondon
Com-
struggle
sharp
chev.
e you
g for

with
with
e ces-
point
self-
very
esent
in the

llletin

point of view of relaxation of tensions, if you want to call it that, than are the Russians. Whether this is a deliberate play between the two of them or whether they are actually taking different lines, it's very difficult to tell.

Q. Mr. Secretary, do you think that a Berlin plebiscite on the lines of the proposal of Chancellor Adenauer would serve a good purpose at the present moment?

A. I would rather not comment on that at the present time. As I understand that situation, the *Senat* in Berlin has said that if the Federal Government of Germany wishes it to hold such a plebiscite it would be willing to do so provided the three occupying powers agreed. As yet we have got nothing official before us, and until we have something official before us and we know what the question might be, and so on, I'd rather not comment on that.

Q. Sir, you mentioned that disarmament seems to have the highest priority going into the summit, and yet the 10-nation talks you also say are in a fairly early stage. How can you reconcile this? What could be done at the summit, given what has been done so far in the 10-nation talks at Geneva?

A. Well, there again I couldn't be explicit. In these talks in Geneva they seemed to have reached a deadlock rather early in the game from the point of view of not knowing where to begin. And there have even been indications that the Russians would like to take a long recess beginning very soon and carrying on into June. We are perfectly willing to take a brief recess, but we see no reason for a long one. And we are frankly puzzled as to whether this indicates that they feel they are just going to keep talking at Geneva without making any headway at all with the idea of Mr. Khrushchev coming up with some kind of idea at the summit. It's a puzzling situation.

Q. Mr. Secretary, does that mean that the Soviets have proposed a cessation of the discussions at Geneva? You said indications.

A. There have been informal discussions of a recess for some 6 weeks or so, not to begin right away but to begin at the end of April and carry on well into June.

Q. Mr. Secretary, have you had any preliminary indications yet as to whether the Russians will go for the Camp David package, and also do you still have any conviction that a treaty can be signed within 30 days—90 days?

A. Well, to answer the last one first, I'm skeptical whether it can be done. We have got a great many things still to work out, some of them that are very difficult from a technical point of view. With regard to the first, it's hard to tell. Up to now, as you know, since then there have only been three meetings held and those have been largely exploratory, asking for more information or explanation of some of the details. I'm still reasonably optimistic that something might come out of it.

Q. Mr. Secretary, on this matter of a recess of the disarmament talks, if the Russians are in favor of a long one and the Western Powers in favor of a short one, does that mean there will be a recess at the end of April of some duration?

A. There may be. We don't know. That is being discussed in Geneva now.⁹

Q. Thank you, sir.

⁹On Apr. 9 a Department press officer read to news correspondents the following statement by Secretary Herter:

"Information received from Geneva this morning indicates that agreement has been reached on a recess in the disarmament negotiations as a result of a general understanding among all 10 delegations rather than on the initiative of any one of them. I personally believe the recess is too long but, in view of the agreement reached, I shall not press for a reopening of the matter."

United States Replies to Chilean Students' Letter to President Eisenhower

Following is the text of a letter to Patricio Fernández, President of the Federation of the Students of Chile, which was delivered at Santiago on April 8 by Walter Howe, U.S. Ambassador to Chile, together with the text of a letter of February 24 from the Chilean students to President Eisenhower.

U.S. LETTER

Press release 180 dated April 8

APRIL 8, 1960

DEAR MR. FERNÁNDEZ: At the time of the visit of President Eisenhower to Chile,¹ you wrote to him on behalf of the Federation of Students of Chile stating in frank and friendly terms your views on a number of hemispheric and world problems. In acknowledging your letter President Eisenhower wrote that a reply would be sent you after your letter had been carefully studied. It is my privilege, on instructions of the President, to convey to you that reply.

Before responding to your observations and comments on the specific political, economic and social problems involved in the relationship between the United States and Latin America, I would like to touch briefly on a few philosophical concepts, which I believe will help in an understanding of the United States of the present day.

While the people of the United States have developed a basic political and economic system which they consider appropriate for themselves (although subject to continuing adjustment and improvement), they do not seek to impose their system on others, recognizing the right of each country to evolve and enjoy its destiny free of foreign intervention.

¹ For background, see BULLETIN of Mar. 28, 1960, p. 471.

The United States does not consider itself a "developed" or a "satisfied" nation. One of the effects of the progressive income tax, social security system, free schools, and other social programs in the United States has been a widespread distribution of the national income. The United States hopes that younger generations abroad will recognize that these advances were made through the determined effort of the people of the United States. The "prevailing order" in each country is only the existing situation in a stage of evolution toward economic and social betterment. It is our desire to assist each country in its efforts to improve the lot of the common man and we, therefore, welcome measures which would make the next "prevailing order" more equitable.

On the domestic scene, our Government is faced with a tremendous challenge of financing the increasing needs of its citizens for education, communication and other services. At the same time, the United States is devoting increasing amounts of its tax revenue and savings to cooperative efforts in the economic and social improvement of other countries of the world. Should the United States ever consider itself "developed" or be "satisfied" with the world, either the millennium will have arrived or we will be slated to disappear into history. We do not expect either contingency.

The United States shares with other governments and people the goal that this hemisphere be composed of sturdy, independent republics, each with a viable developing economy, living under a democratic political and social system of its own particular devising. We recognize that there is much the United States can do in assisting other nations to achieve this goal. We welcome opportunities for exploring new and more effective ways of cooperating in mutually agreeable joint under-

takings directed toward this end. At the same time, we are keenly aware that our efforts can only complement those of our neighbors on their own behalf. Nothing could more quickly prejudice our cooperative efforts than for the United States to seek—even with the best of intentions—to intervene in the domestic affairs of the other American republics.

Admittedly, for governments as for individuals, programs based on the most noble principles are often the most difficult to implement. The world we live in is exceedingly complex. (How much more productive and fruitful would be our lives if our peoples simply had the assurance of peace with freedom.) We make no claim to perfection or infallibility. In our government, as in yours, the exercise of democracy means that progress is made through compromise, adaptation and adjustment, as well as by steadfast purpose. Foreign policy, like domestic policies, results from the reconciling of conflicting positions and interests and can rarely fully satisfy everyone. But this same democratic process provides the means for the correction of errors. As public opinion in our countries becomes better informed of each other's problems, through such means as this present exchange of correspondence, we believe that this corrective process will become more prompt and effective.

Now, to get down to some particulars.

The Inter-American System

You ask "... what is the inter-American system and for what does it exist?" You answer the first part of this question in general terms, mentioning only those specific legal documents which carry with them the joint responsibility for peace and security. Vitally important as this aspect of the inter-American system is, the treaty machinery for peace and security does not by any means comprise all of that system. You most assuredly are informed of the historical development of the unique cooperative inter-American relationship based upon mutual respect, but you should also be aware of the comprehensiveness of the many and varied activities which are being carried on in each of the American Republics by the Organization of American States and its specialized agencies which together make up the permanent structure of the inter-American system.

Without entering into a detailed review of all aspects of inter-American cooperation, I should like to point out, as examples, that the Organization of American States Fellowship Program will help 500 students this coming year to pursue advanced studies in countries other than their own, and that over 5,000 technical specialists have received training under the Technical Cooperation Program of the Organization of American States since its inception; that the malaria eradication program of the Pan American Health Organization is moving forward each year closer to the elimination of that dread scourge from the Americas; and that the activities of the Organization of American States include promotion of economic development, the development of agriculture, improvement of housing, betterment of child welfare and education, advancement of science, and many others.

In Santiago, Chile, for example, the Organization of American States operates a course in economic and financial statistics for training of persons from many of the American Republics. In Bogotá, Colombia, the Organization of American States operates the Inter-American Housing and Planning Center which trains those who will carry on the low-cost housing activities in their own countries. In Montevideo, Uruguay, a specialized organization of the Organization of American States, the Inter-American Children's Institute, concerns itself with child welfare.

These are all parts of the inter-American system; these are all phases of an inter-American program to which my Government contributes heavily, just as it has pioneered a system of bilateral technical cooperation which makes it possible for that kind of assistance to be given and received in a relationship of fraternal cooperation. These, and many other genuinely cooperative programs and projects, are as much parts of the inter-American system as the machinery involved in the quest to achieve collective security, even though their problems and immediate accomplishment may be less spectacular and provide less of a target for hostile and unwarranted attack. Just as with the program of bilateral technical cooperation which we have developed, the total program in Latin America of the Organization of American States, of Operation Pan America and other programs of collective action has the purpose of correcting the very problems about which you express such deep concern, and this program

is carried on without detracting one iota from the sovereignty, independence, or juridical equality of any of the Latin American governments, or from the freedom and dignity of any citizen of a Latin American country. On the contrary, these are strengthened and fortified.

Let us now take a look at the inter-American system for achieving peace among the American nations and security from external aggression. This you find involves "obligations accepted by the weak in favor of the strong, and the poor in favor of the rich." As you must have learned, the inter-American system is based on the principle of non-intervention inextricably combined with the assumption of collective responsibility to act together when that principle is violated, either by aggression from abroad or from within the hemisphere. It may be well to recall, therefore, that in many respects the welding of this system came as the common response to the threat which hung over this hemisphere from Nazi and Fascist dictatorship, a threat which was overcome only to be replaced by the danger of Soviet and other international Communist overt and subversive aggression. The first of these dangers was overcome with tremendous direct loss of lives and property; in the case of the United States alone it involved the loss of tens of thousands of lives and hundreds of billions of dollars worth of material wealth. The absolutely essential preparation to meet and resist the second of those threats has also required something which the people of the United States do not like—the greatest peace-time mobilization of military strength the world has ever known—at a cost which heavily bears upon the income of every single American citizen.

The people of the United States of America did not seek the responsibilities thrust upon it by the need to maintain peace against the aggressive intent of international communism—in fact, those of you who are students of history may recall that the people of the United States, in refusing to join the League of Nations following World War I, rejected such a responsibility once before, with a serious setback to the hopes of that era for a general system for world peace. However, we have now accepted it as a joint responsibility with Chile and other nations which value their freedom and desire to maintain their independence.

Any who believe this contribution by the people of the United States to be misdirected might do

well to try to penetrate the Iron Curtain and find out what happens in Hungary and Rumania, in North Korea or North Viet-Nam or Communist China when the conspiracy of international communism is challenged by individuals or groups who want to live as free men. Where are the students of Hungary who in 1956 challenged this conspiracy? Would you wish to exchange the freedom of thought and expression which Chilean students enjoy for that of students in any Communist country? Freedom is indivisible—its loss by any nation prejudices the entire free world. Obviously, maintaining the physical security in which we can strive to improve our democracy is in our interest, but so also is it in the interest of Latin America. Obviously, the Latin American countries have made and are making an invaluable contribution. That is reciprocity.

You would appear to have overlooked the most important reality of the world of 1960, indeed the most important single fact of the entire post-war world, beginning with the first Soviet threats to Iran, to Greece, to Turkey, and going on to the aggression against Korea, Viet-Nam, Hungary, Tibet and others. That reality is the danger posed by international Communism to the freedom and independence of every government, great or small, rich or poor, whatever its stage of economic or political development. In your country as in the United States, there is all too often a tendency to forget that, whatever may be the weaknesses and inadequacies of our political life, the liberty and individual freedom which we now have would have been utterly destroyed if communism had been permitted to move in the post-war world unhindered and unrestrained by the defensive capacity of the countries which chose to maintain their independence.

From all of this it is difficult to comprehend the reasoning with which you find that our inter-American relationship is a one-way street—with out the element of reciprocity which you desire. If, as your letter seems to imply, you and your fellow students really do believe that the people of the United States have given nothing and have gained all in their relationship with Latin America during a period when so many of the lives of its young men and so much of its wealth have been contributed to building the security of Western civilization, our mutual misunderstandings are indeed profound.

nd find
nia, in
unist
l com-
groups
he stu-
ed this
ge the
hilean
Com-
its loss
world.
rity in
racy is
rest of
erican
luable

e most
ed the
st-war
eats to
to the
ngary,
posed
n and
small,
nic or
in the
ency to
es and
y and
would
had
d un-
apac-
their

d the
the
with-
desire.
your
eople
have
Latin
f the
health
ty of
stand-

llelin

With regard to specific questions you raise:

(1) It is not clear what you mean by "military security by means other than armed forces", but if you mean that expenditures for armaments should be kept to the absolute minimum consistent with security, the United States Government is in full agreement and has offered assistance in the search for the means whereby excessive military expenditures may be reduced and savings applied to urgent needs for economic development. You may be assured that the Government and people of the United States would be delighted at a fruitful outcome of all the efforts which have been made in the United Nations and elsewhere to establish the solid bases for genuine limitation of armaments throughout the world. Bearing in mind the guarantees of the Rio Treaty, we are prepared to cooperate in practical steps to reduce expenditures on armaments in this hemisphere. President Eisenhower made this very clear in his endorsement² of President Alessandri's statesmanlike proposal for the limitation of arms in Latin America.

(2) Promotion of Democracy. As President Eisenhower indicated in Santiago after first reading your letter, the United States does not and could not look "benevolently" on dictators either in the Americas or elsewhere. The principles and practices of democratic life are too much a part of the fabric of our history and governmental institutions and practices for us not to be repelled by the tyrannical abuse of power by governmental leaders. We shall continue to favor any approach to the reduction and elimination of anti-democratic governmental practices which has a real prospect of success. This attitude necessarily implies that the approach is genuinely constructive, is in accordance with international obligations, and represents the consensus of the inter-American community. It would be nothing less than foolhardy to become so obsessed with the destruction of undemocratic regimes as to embark upon actions leading to chaos, anarchy or their replacement by a new but even more dangerous form of tyranny.

The truth of the matter is that democracy, unlike communism or any other form of tyranny, cannot be imposed from without by any nation or group of nations.

² For text of an address to the Chilean Congress by President Eisenhower on Mar. 1, see *ibid.*, p. 480.

As the past ten years have demonstrated, undemocratic systems and practices can be resisted and conditions permitting democratic growth can be established through the earnest efforts of all sectors of a responsible citizenry—and I here definitely include those military leaders in Latin America who have a real understanding of the civic responsibility of the military forces, and who have already made highly significant contributions to the maintenance or restoration of the conditions for greater democracy. The recent years of Latin American political development, with one or two notable exceptions, have shown marked progress in the direction of responsible democratic government.

What all of us can and should strive for is to improve and strengthen the admittedly imperfect democracies in which we live in order that they may serve as examples for others. This moral pressure by example strikes a responsive chord in the hearts of the people.

(3) Economic Cooperation. The third fundamental point that your letter refers to is "an economic integration of Latin America that will permit these countries to industrialize their economies and accelerate their development . . ." Your letter suggests that on this point as well as on the other two fundamental points mentioned therein the United States has failed to lend its full collaboration.

It is only fair to point out that the United States Government has repeatedly and forcefully given its support to the concept of common markets in Latin America which would lead to an expansion of trade within the integrated area and between it and other regions of the world.

In addition, let us also consider some other elements basic to the process of economic development. I refer to improving the knowledge and skills of the population and the provision of adequate capital for industry and agriculture. An abundance of these elements is indispensable for increasing the productivity of labor and eventually placing within the reach of the people an increased supply of the necessities and amenities of modern life. Your letter fails to mention the role of the United States Government or of American private citizens in helping to supply the needs of Latin America in these vital sectors. This role has been immense.

Our Government-owned Eximbank has loaned, since its inception, over \$3,900,000,000 in Latin

America to both state-owned and private enterprises. The great bulk of these loans has been for the purpose of aiding economic development. An example is the \$77 million which made possible the Cia de Acero del Pacifico (CAP). Add to this over \$300 million in loans resulting from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities and \$78 million of our Development Loan Fund, both on extremely liberal repayment terms. Also substantial United States contributions have been made through the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and other international lending institutions.

Investments by private American businesses have been even larger—about \$9 billion; indeed United States private investments in Latin America exceed those in any other region of the world. According to the latest statistics, from these United States private investments came 30% of Latin America's exports. These export earnings created enough foreign exchange to pay for all of the imports and income remitted to the United States by those companies and still return a surplus of \$900 million a year to Latin America. About 625,000 jobs have been created and 15% of all the taxes collected in the area came from United States private investment.

My Government believes that, generally speaking, United States investors in Latin America are taking seriously their responsibilities toward their employees and the people of the countries in which they do business. They are interested in putting their roots down as responsible business citizens of those countries. They want to stay and help in the development process, and it is a gross exaggeration, and in most cases patently untrue, to accuse them of being interested solely in exploiting your countries.

Perhaps it would be timely and useful to explain briefly what we mean by "the free enterprise system" since this is what produces the wealth of the United States. By their own unremitting work and ingenuity, our citizens, in an atmosphere of economic as much as political freedom, produce the goods which are sold for their own consumption and export. Out of their earnings they pay among the highest taxes in the world, and these in turn enable the United States Government to finance the Export-Import Bank, the Development Loan Fund, the Technical Cooperation Program, and to contribute importantly to such international institutions as the International

Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, and the Inter-American Development Bank. But, of even greater importance, they also are able to save a portion of their earnings for investment in industrial enterprises at home and abroad. By thus pooling their savings, their credit and other resources, this nation has developed a system which has so far invested over \$9 billion in Latin America and additional investment is available if wanted. Now, I repeat that we do not argue that our system should be copied by other countries, although we think our own development has been due largely to that system. We do say that this system affords a vast pool of capital for development purposes, more than any government can hope to accumulate for foreign loans.

Our technical cooperation program has afforded training to thousands of Latin Americans in a great variety of fields from agriculture and public health to industrial techniques and public administration. Undoubtedly a substantial number of students of your Federation have studied in the United States or have had United States trained professors assist them in their educational endeavor. Our programs in various fields have helped make this possible. United States-financed plants and commercial establishments in Latin America have also afforded a vast training ground for Latin America in industry, in modern business methods and in management.

This brief description of the role of the United States in helping to supply the needs of Latin America in the fields of capital and of technical skills is only to point out (as your letter did not) that the United States has contributed—and contributed significantly—to the great economic advances that have taken place in Latin America. What is more important is that this contribution is continuing and that together with you, our neighbors, we are constantly seeking ways and means of improving and expanding our cooperation still further for the purpose of raising the standards of living of the masses of the Latin American people.

The Pricing of Raw Materials

The quotation from the Paley Report,³ which

³ For background on the report of the President's International Materials Policy Commission, of which William S. Paley was chairman, and excerpts from a digest of volume 1, issued in June 1952, see *ibid.*, July 14, 1952, p. 54.

you have taken out of context, gives an entirely erroneous impression of the recommendations of that report and of the objectives of United States trade policy. The full report shows how the development of low cost resources benefits raw material producing countries as well as the countries which buy part of these raw materials. In fact, as pointed out below, foreign producers and foreign countries have benefited substantially from policies of the United States Government designed, not to obtain raw materials from foreign sources at the lowest price possible, but to give a fair return to suppliers, whether in the United States or in other countries.

Your letter states that the "moral solution" of the problem of prices is the adoption of the concept of "just prices and adequate remuneration for the raw materials" exported by Latin America. It goes on to admit frankly that the use of an ethical notion of a just price would present many practical problems. Our appreciation that violent fluctuations of raw material prices can cause great difficulties for countries which are heavily dependent on the exports of one or two commodities has caused the United States to cooperate with primary producing countries, not only in Latin America but elsewhere, and in many different ways, in efforts to overcome these difficulties. But the problem is deep-seated and requires basic solution of such matters as rates of economic growth, the need for diversification of production, and the balance of supply and demand. During the time that such fundamental adjustments are being worked out, it may be possible in certain cases to reduce the severity of price fluctuations by arrangements of various kinds among interested countries. In most cases it is possible for countries experiencing temporary balance-of-payments difficulties as a result of commodity price declines to obtain external financial assistance calculated to tide them over.

The United States attaches high importance to finding sound solutions to these problems. Thus it is giving its full support to many international organizations which are currently analyzing problem commodities and endeavoring to assist the producing countries in their marketing problems.

The United States has become a member of the Commission on International Commodity Trade, which was established by the Economic and Social

Council of the United Nations to make studies of the outlook for basic commodities.

The United States, as a member of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, participates in all commodity study groups and the Committee on Commodity Problems.

The Contracting Parties to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade have established a special committee to study obstacles to the expansion of trade in raw materials and develop recommendations for constructive action. The United States is participating actively in this committee.

The United States has price support programs for certain agricultural products and minerals. These are certainly not policies for obtaining raw material imports at "the lowest price possible". If anything, the reverse is true. Foreign suppliers often obtain prices for commodities sold in the United States which exceed world market prices, this being at considerable cost to the United States consumer. With respect to imported raw materials which are not produced domestically, we customarily levy low duties or none at all, and impose few internal taxes. This stimulates our consumption of these products and so redounds to the benefit of the exporting country.

The examples cited below are typical:

Sugar:

The United States buys almost one-half of its annual requirements of sugar, which total about 9.4 million short tons, from foreign suppliers, principally Cuba, at a price which ranges currently between 2 and 2½ cents above the world market price. In this way the United States transfers to the supplier countries, all of which have less developed economies, a total of 200 million dollars annually.

The tariff on sugar entering the United States has been reduced from 2.5 cents to .6250 cents per pound over the past 25 years, to the substantial benefit of foreign producing countries. The clause in the United States Sugar Act which allocates to foreign suppliers 45% of all increases in domestic consumption permits those suppliers to benefit to almost the same extent as domestic producers from the price stabilization features of our sugar legislation.

The United States has been a party to international sugar agreements since 1937, because of

its recognition that stable sugar prices are of great importance to many sugar producing countries of this hemisphere.

Lead and Zinc:

Although the quotas on imports which were established in 1958 reduced imports of these metals to 80 percent of the volume of imports during the previous 5 years, foreign producers have in general received substantially higher prices for the share of their production which is sold in this country than for that sold in other markets. The desire of the United States to help stabilize world prices for these metals is attested by its participation in the establishment of a Lead and Zinc Study Group under the auspices of the United Nations.

Coffee:

The United States does not impose any duty on the importation of green coffee, in contrast to many European countries which maintain relatively high tariffs or internal taxes, or both. (The same is true of cocoa and tea.) As a result, per capita consumption here is among the highest in the world, and more than 23 million bags of coffee were imported into the United States in 1959.

The United States has not sought to obtain its coffee at the lowest possible price but, on the contrary, has given its full support to the establishment of a Coffee Study Group under whose auspices a short-run marketing agreement has been worked out which has maintained prices over the past 2 years at levels which have generally provided a fair profit to producers. The United States continues to support the Study Group in its current efforts to develop a long range program for re-establishing equilibrium between supply and requirements.

Other Commodities:

As for copper prices which are of special interest to you as Chileans, they have been so favorable in recent years that production in your country has increased by 37 percent over the past 5 years.

Recognizing that the stability and expansion of markets for raw materials is a matter of primary importance to the less developed countries of the world, the United States is giving its full support to seeking solutions through international organizations.

Social Evolution

The next portion of your letter contains an invitation, which, if accepted by the United States, could only constitute flagrant intervention in the domestic affairs of Latin American countries. It would set up the United States as the arbiter of matters which only a sovereign people can decide for themselves.

The United States does not "defend the prevailing order," nor does it incite to revolution. To attempt to do so would be the most arrogant kind of colonialism, repugnant to the American people.

In the 18th century our country gained its political independence; a hundred years ago it fought a bloody civil war over a basic national issue and in this century has carried out great social programs and changes. This is the way we dealt with our own particular problems, but we would not impose our pattern or our experience on other nations in their efforts to find better and more equitable national existences.

Our technical cooperation programs are a testimonial to our earnest desire to cope with the great problems you have cited—malnutrition, illiteracy, lack of public health, inadequate housing and others, and we hope that some of our "best friends" are among those we seek to help in our joint work in these fields.

Self-Determination in Cuba

In your letter you commend highly the policies the United States Government is following with respect to the present Cuban Government, without commenting on the position which the Cuban Government has taken toward the United States Government or toward United States citizens who over the past 100 years, and in accordance with Cuban law, have invested their savings in the Cuban economy. No officials of this administration have ever made any public statements or committed any acts which may reasonably be construed as unfriendly toward the Cuban Government and people. It is regretted that the same cannot be said for the leaders of the Cuban Government who seem to have intentionally made derogatory and most hostile statements regarding the United States Government and people, designed to disrupt our traditionally amicable relations.

As students you desire to ascertain the truth;

therefore, it is suggested that you examine the record fully and fairly before reaching a judgment on such a serious matter.

Your letter indicates that you also find elements in the Cuban situation which cause you concern. This concern appears to be shared generally throughout the hemisphere, and not only in those countries which were the targets of the series of invasion attempts launched from Cuba last year.

In all candor I must state that many long-time friends of Cuba in the United States and elsewhere in the hemisphere who were heartened by the ideals expressed by the present leaders of Cuba when they assumed control of the Government have been gravely disillusioned by what is coming to be considered a betrayal of these ideals in such matters as freedom of expression, equal protection of the laws, and the right freely to choose a representative government.

The press of the United States, like the press of Chile, is free to voice its opinions on all matters, whether domestic or foreign; this, you will agree, is a freedom basic to the exercise of democracy. Unfortunately, recent incidents in Cuba make it quite clear that it is dangerous for anyone there to voice opinions which do not conform with government policy.

On the subject of agrarian reform you recognize that the United States has given evidence over a period of years of its interest in and sympathy for agrarian reform movements. In Latin America, my government has demonstrated its interest in promoting rural welfare through a variety of assistance programs, including technical assistance, Export-Import Bank loans, and such farm development and land settlement programs as that in Guatemala. You mention several countries in which agrarian reform movements were carried out with support from the United States and then, mentioning Cuba, inquire why our policy is different.

The United States is not opposed to land reform in Cuba any more than it is in any other part of the world. In our notes of June 11⁴ and October 12, 1959,⁵ to the Cuban Government on this matter, the Government of the United States expressed its full support of soundly conceived

⁴ For the substance of the note of June 11, see *ibid.*, June 29, 1959, p. 958.

⁵ Not printed.

programs for rural betterment, including land reform. The United States Government at the same time expressed its firm belief that their attainment is not furthered by the failure of the Government of Cuba to recognize the legal rights of United States citizens who have made investments in Cuba in reliance upon the adherence of the Government of Cuba to principles of equity and justice. No property owner can feel secure or engage in productive labor on his own land unless laws are observed.

The United States protests were directed against arbitrary actions of Cuban officials and others, taken in disregard of that country's own laws as well as of international law.

You may be interested in knowing something of the contribution United States private investors have in the past made to the Cuban economy, which provides one of the highest national incomes in Latin America. A report issued in 1956 shows that payments by United States companies in Cuba for salaries and wages were \$140 million. Over 70,000 persons were employed at an average annual wage rate of \$2,000. Of the 70,000 employees of these companies, only 320 were sent from the United States.

In concluding, let me assure you that the idea of foreign intervention into Cuban affairs is as distasteful to the United States as would be the intervention into the domestic affairs of any other American republic. You will recall the role which the United States played, along with the other American republics, in coming to the assistance of Panama and other Caribbean republics when their territory was invaded last year by forces which departed from Cuba, and in taking a position at the Santiago Meeting of Foreign Ministers held in August.⁶ The position of the United States on intervention is very clear.

This has been a lengthy reply to your letter. The many points which you raised are of keen interest to the peoples of the hemisphere and it is to be hoped that our correspondence will contribute to a greater degree of mutual understanding. Because of the growing interest in Latin America among students in the United States, steps have been taken to circulate your letter to university organizations in the United States. Perhaps you will wish to circulate this reply in Chile. In this way it may be possible to stimulate

⁶ For background, see BULLETIN of Sept. 7, 1959, p. 342.

a greater exchange of ideas and information between the youth of our republics.

Please accept, through me, the warm good wishes of President Eisenhower to you and your fellow students and the expression of his conviction that the youth of the hemisphere will devise increasingly effective means of achieving our common goal.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER HOWE
American Ambassador

Sr. PATRICIO FERNÁNDEZ,
*President of the Federation
of Students of Chile.*

CHILEAN LETTER

Unofficial translation

FEBRUARY 24, 1960

YOUR EXCELLENCY, Welcome to Chile. Please accept through our intermediary the cordial greeting of the twenty-five thousand students who today study in the seven Chilean universities and who tomorrow will be responsible, to a large degree, for the destiny of this country.

We know that your obligations are heavy and your time short, but we believe that, for a statesman such as yourself, the human and social values of these countries and the opinions which qualified observers may have of these values, and of the future, are much more important than the routine of protocol: full of monotonous and flattering limitations.

We, the Chilean university leaders, have been elected in the separate federations of students, through a direct vote, both free and secret, and represent all political groups. The majority of us are Christians. And almost all of us, Christians and free thinkers, are firm supporters of democracy and in opposition to all types of dictatorship. Permit us, then, to express to you with friendship, with respect, and with frankness, our thinking on some fundamental aspects of the relationship of the United States with Latin America and with Chile.

What is the Inter-American System and for what does it exist?

The relationship between the United States and the 20 Latin American nations is framed by a group of treaties and other legal documents of an international character, obligatory and current, such as the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro (1947), the Caracas Declaration (1954), Military Pacts, etc. which make up the Inter-American System. What is the deep political "philosophy", the principle inspiring all of these agreements? One is very clear: *To establish by legal obligation, Latin American solidarity with the U.S.* in the present dangerous world situation. North American diplomacy has succeeded in achieving this already. We have stopped being "good neighbors" and have begun to be, without realizing it, "as-

sociated nations" in the world policies of the United States. The truth is that the Inter-American System is the most complete of the many international arrangements in which the United States takes part. But it is equally true that in no other does the United States obtain more *advantages*, at the same time acquiring fewer *obligations* in respect to its associates.

If this lack of *equilibrium* is maintained, not only will it compromise Inter-American relations, but it will also destroy the moral and political justification for the existence of the Inter-American System.

To sum up: In order to express our conviction with the promised frankness: the Inter-American System is up to the present time a regime of obligations accepted by the weak in favor of the strong, and the poor in favor of the rich. No one can say exactly what the *reciprocal obligations* are which the rich and strong nation contracts with the weak and poor nations, nor what their importance is.

What can be done? *Reciprocity* and not aid should be the moral basis of the Inter-American System and the *reciprocity* between the United States and Latin America should materialize in three fundamental ways.

1) Military security within the continent by other means other than the armed forces (more than 1.5 billion dollars each year are spent by these countries guarding themselves from one another).

2) Promotion of democracy. Denying "salt and water" to the dictators and tyrants in power (such as Trujillo, Somoza and Stroessner) instead of looking at them benevolently and making easy for them the exploitation and *vilification* of their peoples, under the pretense that they are "friends" of the U.S.A. and "enemies" of "communism".

3) An economic integration of Latin America that will permit these countries to industrialize their economies and accelerate their development in a way more compatible with the elementary necessities of civilization.

In none of these three fundamental points has the United States assumed the initiative, nor has it lent its collaboration where this would have been decisive for success. It has abstained or given only the "lip service" of innocuous declarations. This is in sharp contrast with the vigor of the initiative, the persistence of purpose and the immense sacrifice for the work in Europe—the Marshall Plan; NATO; "off shore" procurement; the Dillon Plan; all this to obtain the same results that the Latin American nations needed more urgently than Western Europe. The eventual evasive reply to this is that the Latin American countries themselves, without the help of the United States, should modify the armament policy, promote democratic government and integrate their economy within new multinational structures. We admit that in "theory" it is so, but in "practice", the presence or the absence of the United States with its enormous influence and resources of every kind, means the difference between making an immediate reality of the aforementioned three fundamental points or keeping them for another century and a half suspended in the blue air.

Just prices and moral basis for exchange:

The gap that separates the industrial countries from the nations producing raw materials widens more each

United
tem is
range-
t it is
es ob-
fewer

y will
ll also
the ex-

th the
up to
by the
of the
l obli-
tracts
impor-

ld be
the Amer-

other
illion
arding

rater"
nijillo,
m be-
n and
t they
ism".
t will
omes
com-
ation.
s the
nt its
e for
service"
with
e and
—the
Dill-
t the
West-
at the
elp of
policy,
their
admit
ce or
is in-
rence
men-
a for

from
each

letin

year. Industrial nations continue increasing their capital at the expense of under-developed countries, and prices of raw materials continue to be distorted by the industrial countries, including the United States, through different means, all of which are directed toward "obtaining foreign raw materials at the lowest price possible" (Paley Report—1952 "Resources for Freedom").

These means, which seem permissible to those directing the North American economy, have disastrous consequences for Latin American countries.

Then, if our capitalization cannot base itself on the exploitation of other countries, as was the case with Europe for four centuries, and it cannot be based on the unmerciful exploitation of our own people as the communist alternative demands, the moral solution demands that it be the product of just prices and adequate remuneration for the raw materials which we sell to the industrial nations.

We understand that the substitution of an ethical notion of a just price, and one in accordance with the needs of the producing country, for the false concept of "market mechanism", offers many practical problems. But all of them may be solved if this new principle to regulate economic relations between the United States and Latin America is accepted.

"Sabbath has been made for man and not man for the Sabbath"

This quotation from Our Lord Jesus Christ seems an appropriate one for us to illustrate a fundamental question. Has the United States become a "satisfied nation", one which fights for the maintenance of the prevailing order in the world and in Latin America? This dangerous image is becoming more accepted every day. If this is true, we must respectfully say to you that the United States will have little or nothing to offer the younger generation and the immense multitude of the poor, who compose 90% of the Latin American population. And we will have little or nothing to expect from the guidance and genius of North America.

In the United States, and in Western Europe, it makes sense to fight to defend the "prevailing order", because there social order represents values which are shared by everybody: Personal freedom, social justice, real equality in the law, high cultural, scientific and technological levels, satisfactory standards of living, etc. In Latin America to "defend the prevailing order" means maintaining the privileges of a thin layer of the population which controls the power and the wealth, surrounded by an ocean of poor people for whom the "social order" means little or literally nothing. Proofs? Despite the fact that the population of Latin America is only 7% of the world's population, in a territory covering 16% of the inhabitable surface of the planet, our collective standard or condition of living is reflected in the following figures:

Two-thirds of the population (120 million) live in a chronic state of malnutrition (FAO); two out of five Latin Americans (70 million) are illiterate (UNESCO); Latin America has the lowest rate of economic development in the Western World (1% a year per capita), or

an average income of only US\$275 per annum (ECLA).

If trees are known by their fruit, it is a mockery to pretend that this situation reflects the Christian or the democratic order for which the immense mass of starved, illiterate and uncultured people, as well as those lacking rights, freedom and property, populating the majority of Latin America, could hope. It is a crime against the spirit. If the injustices of today are all that Christianity or democracy can offer this continent, no one should be surprised if the best children of these nations turn toward communism, seeking those elementary needs which they lack and which are the essentials to morality and civilization: Food, shelter, and education.

It is true that the United States apparently finds its "best friends" those always willing to hold North American points of view, whatever they may be: willing to flatter North American officials and to serve North American business—in the small group of privileged Latin Americans to whom the "prevailing order" in this starved and illiterate America means the right to enjoy a standard of living which would be envied by the multi-millionaires of the United States.

But they are not "friends" of the United States: they are the friends of their own privileges, which they aspire to identify with North American interests in order that they themselves may be supported by the United States.

Mr. President: We think that the great mission of the United States in Latin America is not to become involved in the "defense of the prevailing order" nor to let itself be "administered" by selfish beneficiaries, but rather that the United States should encourage by all legitimate means those who fight for the creation of a new social order, one which would be closer to Lincoln's immortal definition, "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people".

Respect for self-determination in Cuba

The Cuban revolution is being observed with great attention and even with immense hope by all progressive Latin American sectors, especially the University youth.

We know and applaud your recent official declaration, serene and respectful, with regard to the self-determination of the Cuban nation, but so different, unfortunately, from the campaign of hatred, calumny and distortion broadcast by two great North American news agencies and stridently repeated by the Latin American press which serves the selfish interests of the groups which feel themselves threatened.

The anti-Cuban campaign has revived these days with the complicity of several Latin American countries waiting for the Cuban sugar quota in the North American market. (Latin America owes its historical nullification and material poverty to such small and despicable "statesmen".) Press pressure shall be renewed in order to paralyze the Cuban government in its plans for social reform or to encourage a shameless foreign intervention.

Your Excellency: In our modest opinion, North American intervention in Cuba would be "not only a crime" (the phrase is Talleyrand's) but an "immense stupidity". It would be an unforgivable abuse which would mortally wound the moral and psychological basis

of the Inter-American System and the collaboration of our nations with yours. You would have the interested applause of the small circle of individuals who encourage you to intervene because this is convenient for their own self-interest; but you would lose forever the respect and the confidence of the young, the poor and the decent people of Latin America.

At the same time, we want you to understand that we do not give unconditional adhesion to the Cuban experiment. We are also discouraged by the length of one man's term in office and the lack of institutions based on the will of the people. But it seems to us that it is plainly immoral to classify the Cuban revolution, its government or its social fulfillments, especially the agricultural reform, as "communist". We shall not enter into useless details, but it is scandalous and terrifying to confirm that North American news agencies, and not a few U.S. legislators and public men, attack agrarian reform in Cuba as being "communist". This reform is more moderate and generous with old land owners than that carried out by General MacArthur in Japan or the agrarian reforms supported in full by the United States in Egypt, Israel, India, Pakistan, Vietnam, etc.

Why this difference? Is it because seven North American companies on the island own two million hectares of land? If this is a reason for the United States to attack Cuba for the same action it has supported with all its strength in other countries, how can anyone escape the dangerous conclusion that North American private investment is the worst threat to free national decisions and social progress? Has anybody thought of the dismal consequences of such a conclusion?

Some time ago, here in Santiago, an Ambassador of the United States spoke in such an arrogant way of "the lesson of Guatemala" that the Chilean Senate condemned it unanimously. Now others apparently prepare "the lesson of Cuba". Because your personal and official position, Excellency, has been clear and different, we do not believe that we are lacking respect to you if we add that those who try to give Latin America these "lessons" of submitting to North American private interests are digging the grave of the Inter-American System and, perhaps, of democracy itself in this part of the hemisphere. Beware! These anguished nations are much closer to the limit of their resistance and to the rupture point than the "satisfied" of this world think. World conditions have changed and continue to do so rapidly. In today's world, it is no longer force, but reason and law; no longer fear, but inspiration and example, which are the arms in the battle for the minds of men and the confidence of people.

Therefore, you may be assured that the university students of Chile support with all their hearts the solemn promise which you have given to respect the free decision of the Cuban people. We reject with indignation and contempt any attempt of governments or private interests to intervene in Cuba by armed force, by economic reprisals or by press attacks, of which the Cuban revolution has for so long been a victim.

Mister President, we apologize for this long letter, but we felt it our duty to write to you on the solemn

occasion of your first visit to Latin America and to our country.

There could never be a better time and a better place for the United States, if so desired, to demonstrate to the world that which humanity can expect from the nation of Washington, Lincoln and Roosevelt.

Accept our respectful homage,
For the Federation of Students of Chile

EDUARDO ZUNIGA
Secretary General

PATRICIO FERNÁNDEZ
President

Letters of Credence

Colombia

The newly appointed Ambassador of Colombia, Carlos Sanz de Santamaría, presented his credentials to President Eisenhower on April 1. For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 166 dated April 1.

Panama

The newly appointed Ambassador of Panama, Erasmo de la Guardia, presented his credentials to President Eisenhower on April 8. For texts of the Ambassador's remarks and the President's reply, see Department of State press release 178 dated April 8.

Harlan Bartholomew To Aid in Agadir Reconstruction

The Department of State announced on April 7 (press release 175) that Harlan Bartholomew, Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission, would go to Agadir, Morocco, on April 8 in response to a request from the Government of Morocco for a high-level American city planner to join those of other countries in formulating preliminary plans for the reconstruction of the earthquake-damaged city of Agadir.¹

Mr. Bartholomew is going to Agadir under the auspices of the International Cooperation Administration.

¹ For an exchange of messages between President Eisenhower and King Mohammed V, see BULLETIN OF APR. 18, 1960, p. 600.

President Urges Liberalization of Immigration Restrictions

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT TO THE CONGRESS¹

To the Congress of the United States:

I again urge the liberalization of some of our existing restrictions upon immigration.

The strength of this Nation may be measured in many ways—military might, industrial productivity, scientific contributions, its system of justice, its freedom from autocracy, the fertility of its land and the prowess of its people. Yet no analytical study can so dramatically demonstrate its position in the world as the simple truth that here, more than any other place, hundreds of thousands of people each year seek to enter and establish their homes and raise their children.

To the extent possible, without dislocating the lives of those already living here, this flow of immigration to this country must be encouraged. These persons who seek entry to this country seek more than a share in our material prosperity. The contributions of successive waves of immigrants show that they do not bring their families to a strange land and learn a new language and a new way of life simply to indulge themselves with comforts. Their real concern is with their children, and as a result those who have struggled for the right of American citizenship have, in countless ways, shown a deep appreciation of its responsibilities. The names of those who make important contributions in the fields of science, law, and almost every other field of endeavor indicate that there has been no period in which the immigrants to this country have not richly rewarded it for its liberality in receiving them.

In the world of today our immigration law badly needs revision.

Ideally, I believe that this could perhaps be accomplished best by leaving immigration policy

subject to flexible standards. While I realize that such a departure from the past is unlikely now, a number of bills have already been introduced which contain the elements of such an idea. The time is ripe for their serious consideration so that the framework of a new pattern may begin to evolve.

For immediate action in this session I urge two major acts:

First, we should double the 154,000 quota immigrants that we are presently taking into our country.

Second, we should make special provision for the absorption of many thousands of persons who are refugees without a country as a result of political upheavals and their flight from persecution.

The first proposal would liberalize the quotas for every country and, to an important extent, moderate the features of existing law which operate unfairly in certain areas of the world. In this regard, I recommend the following steps:

1. The removal of the ceiling of 2,000 on quotas within the Asiatic-Pacific triangle;

2. The basing of the overall limitation on immigration on the 1960 census as soon as it is available in place of that of 1920 which is the present base;

3. The annual acceptance of one-sixth of 1 percent of our total population;

4. Abandonment of the concept of race and ethnic classifications within our population, at least for the purposes of the increases in quotas I have recommended, by substituting as the base for computation the number of immigrants actually accepted from each area between 1924 and 1959. In other words the increase in the quota for Italy, for example, would not be based upon a percentage

¹ H. Doc. 360, 86th Cong., 2d sess.; transmitted on Mar. 17.

of a so-called Italian ethnic group within our country, but upon a percentage of actual immigration from Italy between 1924 and 1959; and

5. The unused quotas of undersubscribed countries should be distributed among oversubscribed countries. This distribution should be in proportion to the quotas of the oversubscribed countries.

My second major proposal is for authorization for the parole into this country of refugees from oppression. They are persons who have been forced to flee from their homes because of persecution or fear of persecution based upon race, religion, or political opinions, or they are victims of world political upheaval or national calamity which makes it impossible for them to return to their former homes.

This year has been designated World Refugee Year.² The United States and 68 other nations have joined together in an attempt to seek perma-

nent solutions for the problems of these peoples. Nations who in the past have granted entry to the victims of political or religious persecutions have never had cause to regret extending such asylum. These persons with their intellectual idealism and toughness will become worthwhile citizens and will keep this Nation strong and respected as a contributor of thought and ideals.

I have asked the Attorney General to submit a draft of legislation to implement the recommendations I have made. The administration stands ready to supply whatever information is necessary to permit appropriate action by the Congress during its present session. If, notwithstanding my specific recommendations, the Congress should enact other or different liberalizations of our immigration law that are constructive, I will be glad to approve them.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 17, 1960.

² For background, see BULLETIN of June 15, 1959, p. 872.

Citizens by Choice

by John W. Hanes, Jr.

Administrator, Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs¹

The purpose of this anniversary meeting is, I understand, to honor "Citizens by Choice"—the almost 5 million naturalized citizens who have become Americans since the Council was first formed. With this theme, the timing of your conference could not have been more happily coincidental in view of the President's momentous message of yesterday² on immigration and refugee matters if it had been so planned. For the theme of the President's message might very well be "Immigrants by Choice."

"Citizens by Choice" means that, although under no compulsion to do so, most immigrants want to

and have become Americans, a very large number of them with the help and encouragement of organizations such as yours.

With regard to immigrants, "choice" is a term of much more flexible meaning. Some immigrants do indeed come to our country solely as a matter of their own choice, as has historically been true; they are the bold and the adventurous and those who feel that there is something here which they cannot find in their own homeland and which they value enough to start a new life in a new country. Increasingly in recent years, however, the choice which has faced those who come to our shores is a choice which has been dictated not by themselves. Some are homeless because of Communist oppression or because of other types of political upheaval, wars, or natural disasters;

¹ Address made before the 30th anniversary conference of the National Council on Naturalization and Citizenship at New York, N.Y., on Mar. 18.

² For text, see p. 659.

others are forced to seek a new life because of economic and population pressures within their homelands.

There always exists, however, another aspect of choice with regard to those who would come to our country, and that is *our* choice of them. It is one of the most fundamental attributes of sovereignty that any nation retains the right to select those who shall enter its borders. Since 1921 our own regulations have been both qualitative and quantitative. I am certain that none of us would wish to abandon these two basic controls, for certainly we would not wish to have come here subversives and criminals. Even with regard to the sick and the infirm, our natural feelings of humanity must always be tempered by an awareness of the similar problems that exist within our own boundaries and our facilities to care adequately for our own citizens similarly afflicted.

When numerical limitations were first imposed on immigration, our country was not the major international leader which it is now. Today the United States is the foremost power in the free world. As such, it must always remember that its leadership is expressed by all its actions in all fields. This most particularly includes our attitude toward those who seek a life of freedom in our country.

This aspect of immigration and refugee policy is a very integral part of our foreign policy, and it is in this area that the particular interest of the Department of State lies. Former Secretary of State Dulles, testifying before the Congress in April 1956,³ expressed this when he said:

. . . my primary concern as Secretary of State is that whatever overall quota is adopted by the Congress be apportioned equitably. Our quota restrictions should not discriminate among persons merely on the basis of their national origin, nor should the restrictions discriminate unfairly against any of the friendly nations which have an interest in common with us in the defense of the free world. The present system of determining quotas is offensive on both counts. . . . The impact of this situation is felt in our relationships with friendly nations every day.

National-Origins System

Our present law is based on what is called the national-origins system. The supporters of this system feel, sincerely, that its maintenance is essen-

tial to the maintenance of the traditional character of American life.

In examining this system I feel we should first be clear as to what it is. In its simplest elements it is an attempt to perpetuate the same ethnic balance in the makeup of the American population as existed in 1920. This objective has been sought by controlling immigration after 1924 in accordance with percentages based on the 1920 makeup.

I disagree with the national-origins system as a basis of our national immigration policy primarily on two grounds.

The first is that the world of 1960 is not the world of 1920, nor is the position of the United States in the world of today the position that it was 30 to 40 years ago. Any attempt artificially to maintain a particular aspect of that former world must, it seems to me, become increasingly unrealistic and distant from facts as they exist with the passing of each additional year.

My second disagreement is based on the plain fact that the operation of our system over the years is not maintaining that balance which the national-origins system was supposed to maintain. Let me give you some examples of this.

In the years since 1924 there has been a very large nonquota immigration from the Western Hemisphere, which has resulted in a material change in the ethnic composition of our population. Another fact is that, particularly since World War II, there has been a very large nonquota immigration of the wives and husbands and children of American citizens from many countries whose actual quotas are very small. As a striking example of this I might mention that, although the quota of Japan is only 185 per year, last year's nonquota immigration from Japan, almost all of which fell into this category I have just described, exceeded 5,000. Furthermore, the entire trend of recent legislation, again primarily since World War II—both special refugee legislation and other special legislation such as that making nonquota immigrants out of backlogged preference-quota applicants—has naturally been to circumvent the restrictions imposed by the national-origins system. It is obvious that this must be so since the need for such special legislation has been only in the case of persons who come from countries with oversubscribed quotas.

Please do not misunderstand me on this point.

³ BULLETIN of May 7, 1956, p. 773.

I certainly do not criticize such special legislation as has been passed to alleviate these special problems. This legislation has in almost all cases been passed to meet a real and pressing need. I merely point out that its effect has been the opposite of maintaining the national-origins system; and I further point out that special legislation designed to meet one particular problem, in most cases only for a certain specified time, is both administratively and budgetarily unsound and costly because it requires the recurrent assembly and disassembly of machinery to operate each successive program. It would also seem to have a political disadvantage, because each temporary expedient provides only a temporary solution and each one invites other pressures to alleviate other problems by similar temporary expedients.

For these reasons it would seem to me both more honest and wiser to meet the obviously changed situation which exists today by the means of carefully drawn permanent legislation rather than by continued reliance on an emergency or piecemeal approach year by year.

It is, of course, the responsibility of the Congress under our system of government to determine immigration policy. President Eisenhower has recognized this fact and has repeatedly urged full congressional study of the entire immigration system since the first months of his administration in 1953. However, in the absence of such basic congressional action, the President has also frequently recommended specific remedial legislation to meet the most urgent situations which have arisen over the past 7 years.

The Administration's New Immigration Bill

The President's message of yesterday on this subject is but the latest in the series of recommendations which he has made in this general field. His message basically was limited to two major subjects: a recommendation that the entire quota and national-origins system be restudied and changed, coupled with a specific interim recommendation that quotas be approximately doubled; and a recommendation concerning the urgent need for special refugee legislation in order that the World Refugee Year not become the first year since World War II to find the United States without some special ability to receive a reasonable number of the most meritorious refugee cases.

I believe you might be interested in a very brief

analysis of the administration's new immigration bill, introduced as a result of the President's message into the House of Representatives by both Congressman [William E.] Miller of New York [H.R. 11234] and your own Congressman John Lindsay of New York City [H.R. 11235].

First, with regard to the quota itself, present quotas are computed on the basis of the *white* United States population as shown by the 1920 census. The proposed quotas would be computed on the *total* United States population as shown by the 1950 census and, as soon as it is completed, by the 1960 census. The minimum quota for any country would be doubled—from 100 to 200. In addition, unused quota numbers (which generally run around 50,000 per year, primarily from such countries as the United Kingdom and Ireland), which at present are forever lost, would under the new bill be available during the next year for use by persons who come from countries with oversubscribed quotas and who are in preference categories. Further, the distribution of these newly available numbers, rather than being based on the national-origins makeup of the United States as of 1920, would in future be based on the actual immigration into the United States from the various countries over the past 35 years.

Perhaps one or two specific examples would help illustrate the effect of the new bill. The present quota of Italy, for example, is 5,666 persons per year. Based on a most conservative method of figuring, we estimate that the Italian quota, plus its share of unused quota numbers, would be about 30,000 after 1960. The present Japanese quota is 185. We estimate this would rise to about 2,900. The present Polish quota is 6,488. We estimate this would rise to approximately 28,000.

The net result would be that the present quota of 154,887 would be approximately doubled, and would amount to about 300,000.

In addition the proposed legislation would remove the present quota ceiling of 2,000 on the so-called Asia-Pacific triangle and would guarantee that any new political entities which might be created in the world, such as The West Indies federation, would under no circumstances have a lower quota than they had prior to their formation.

The second major section of the proposed bill is the refugee provisions. The bill would define a refugee as an alien who has fled a Communist area or a country in the Middle East to escape

persecution based on race, religion, or political opinion, or who is away from and unable to return to his home because of natural calamities, military operations, or political upheaval, and who is in a non-Communist area and in need of help.

Under the proposed legislation the Attorney General would be permitted to parole into the United States up to 10,000 refugees per year selected by the Secretary of State; and the President by proclamation could permit additional refugees to enter in the same manner by making a special finding that such additional refugees were in need of assistance and that it was in the United States' interest to grant them admission. In addition the Attorney General would be given authority to adjust the status of any refugee so admitted to that of permanent resident after a 2-year period if the refugee had demonstrated good character.

Finally, the new legislation would eliminate the present requirement on our visa applications to ask for information about the applicants' race and ethnic classification—information which we feel serves no useful purpose.

Record of Immigration Proposals

I recognize, of course, that immigration matters, which are of such deep interest to so many persons within this country, are inevitably problems which will arouse political controversy. I recognize that some may say—this being the year of 1960—that the President's message and the bill which I have just been describing are recently conceived proposals for purposes of election-year politics. I would like to point out that the record does not bear this out.

In April 1953, 3 months after his inauguration, President Eisenhower in a letter to Senator Arthur Watkins,⁴ who was chairman of the Joint Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy, recommended congressional study looking toward fundamental revision of the immigration statute. Also in 1953 the President recommended and the Congress passed the Refugee Relief Act.⁵ Again in 1956, again in 1957, the President sent major messages to the

Congress⁶ reiterating and making more explicit his recommendations for revision of the basic immigration law, based on a careful congressional study of the problem. These major messages have been interspersed by a continued reiteration of the President's position on this subject in the intervening years and by his many special messages and recommendations on more specific aspects of the general problem such as his interventions concerning the Hungarian refugee crisis.⁷ The President's major message of March 17, 1960, is, therefore, actually only the latest in a continual series that dates back to the earliest days of this administration.

Obviously this latest proposal is not totally different from the President's previous proposals. It would be odd if it were, for they, too, reflected careful thought and detailed study. At the same time, this latest proposal also reflects an awareness of the continually changing circumstances which always have existed and always will exist in this field. I can speak with considerable personal knowledge of the evolution of many of these proposals over the years, for I have been privileged to be associated with such matters in the Department of State since 1953. As you know, the Departments of State and Justice are the two executive agencies most responsible for carrying out United States policy in this field and therefore are the two agencies most responsible for developing technical recommendations.

Based on my experience, however, and as one who is at the "working level" of Government, I also wish to point up the importance, when attempting to move forward in an area such as this, of interested and active leadership from the top levels of the Government. In this field the continued personal interest both of President Eisenhower and of Vice President Nixon has been indispensable, and there are many specific parts of the finished product, in the form of yesterday's message and bill, which reflect the personal ideas and intervention of these two most senior leaders of the administration.

In truth, immigration policy—refugee policy—is not and should not be a partisan issue. It is instead one of the most basic issues of American

⁴ For text, see *ibid.*, May 18, 1953, p. 730.

⁵ For a statement by President Eisenhower, see *ibid.*, Aug. 17, 1953, p. 201.

⁶ For texts, see *ibid.*, Feb. 20, 1956, p. 275, and Feb. 18, 1957, p. 247.

⁷ For background, see *ibid.*, Nov. 19, 1956, p. 807, and Dec. 10, 1956, p. 913.

national and international policy. Those who have recognized this fact, whatever their views, have been found in both parties. Those who have exhibited leadership in this field, whatever their views, have also been found in both parties. Given the facts of American politics, I suppose it is too much to hope that such an irresistible subject will ever be removed from partisanship, but at least we can strive to see that the partisan issues interfere as little as possible with the careful study and thoughtful debate which should underlie whatever the United States may do in this field. For assuredly all of us, of all parties and all opinions, must benefit or suffer equally from the results of what is done.

In closing I would like to speak of the merger which is taking place today between the National Council on Naturalization and Citizenship and the American Immigration Conference. This merger is symbolic of the fact that an interest in those who immigrate does not cease with their successful crossing of our borders. Immigration is quite clearly only the first step in a process that will continue until the immigrant has become, in every sense, an American.

We in Government who deal with the official aspects of these problems are deeply conscious of the valuable services performed by such organizations as these two which are about to join. We hope that the new organization will profit both from the experience and wisdom of the Council as well as from the enthusiasm and knowledge of related problems which will be contributed by the much younger sister organization, the Conference.

Many people in Government have had a long and fruitful collaboration with the Council and its activities. Referring to only a few, there are here today Miss [Frances G.] Knight from the Passport Office, who in this sense continues the association initiated by her predecessor, Mrs. [Ruth] Shipley, and Mr. [Frank L.] Auerbach of the Visa Office, both, of course, from the Department of State; from the Immigration Service, Al Devaney, Helen Eckerson, and Ed Rudnick are equally well known to all of you and have worked closely with all of you.

It is my special privilege to bring today the birthday greetings and best wishes for the future to all of you here from both Attorney General Rogers and from Secretary of State Herter, and to these I most sincerely add my own.

Cherry Blossom Festival Highlights U.S.-Japanese Friendship

*Remarks by J. Graham Parsons
Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs¹*

This year, as we meet here at the Japanese lantern to participate in the traditional opening of the National Cherry Blossom Festival, there are special reasons for calling attention to our ties with Japan. We celebrate in 1960 the centennial of the first Japanese embassy to the United States.

The coming of this first diplomatic mission aroused great interest because it was only 6 years earlier that our own Commodore Perry had obtained the opening of Japan to the outside world. The visitors in their ceremonial attire caught the imagination of another great American, Walt Whitman, who was standing in the crowds of Manhattan as they passed. He celebrated their advent in his poem "A Broadway Pageant."

Walt Whitman accurately prophesied the great mutual benefit which would result from this inaugural visit. The exposure of Japan to Western ideas and technology profoundly altered the fabric of Japanese life and her national destiny. Today, a century later, Japan has become a great modern nation with democratic institutions blended to suit her ancient heritage, with a thriving economy opening ever new vistas to her vital, industrious people, and with a world view which emphasizes her determination to live in peace as a good neighbor of other peoples.

We in America, as Whitman foresaw, have also come to admire and benefit from much that is Japanese. These beautiful trees are symbolic of the growing influence of Japanese culture on life in the United States. Our art, our homes, and our very outlook on life have been subtly influenced in many ways by the love of nature and of refined simplicity which is so much a part of the Japanese scene. Hundreds of thousands of Americans who have lived or traveled in Japan in the postwar years have brought home vivid memories of a beautiful land and of an enterprising and imaginative people.

There are many reasons to hope that in the years ahead America and Japan will derive greater benefit than ever from the new relation-

¹ Made at the opening ceremonies of the National Cherry Blossom Festival at Washington, D.C., on Apr. 5 (press release 170).

ship between our two countries. Only a few weeks ago, in the East Room of the White House, where a hundred years before President Buchanan had received the first Japanese envoys, President Eisenhower received a Japanese delegation which signed with us a new treaty of mutual cooperation and security.² This treaty is a symbol of a new and voluntary association for the defense of our respective ways of life in the troubled world of today. Neither Yukio Ozaki, who gave these cherry trees to the Capital, nor Walt Whitman, seer that he was, could have dreamed of this great and free association of Japan and the United States as we enter the second century of our diplomatic relations. In this anniversary year of 1960 the friendship symbolized by the gift of these cherry trees takes on a new and deeper significance for all of us.

U.S. and Philippines Open Air Transport Negotiations

Press release 172 dated April 5

The Governments of the Republic of the Philippines and the United States will open negotiations for a new air transport agreement at Washington on April 26, 1960. The former agreement¹ was terminated at the request of the Government of the Philippines on March 3, 1960. The composition of the delegations will be determined later.

U.S. and Philippine Presidents Exchange Messages on Sugar Quota

White House press release dated April 4

The White House on April 4 made public the following exchange of telegrams between President Eisenhower and Carlos P. Garcia, President of the Philippines.

President Eisenhower to President Garcia

MARCH 31, 1960

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have received your telegram of March 17 asking that I increase the Philippine sugar quota. As you know, the sugar

² For text, see BULLETIN of Feb. 8, 1960, p. 179.

¹ Treaties and Other International Acts Series 1577 and 1844.

quotas are determined by Congress and any modification would require Congressional action. Since the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended in 1956, expires this year, Congress is expected to consider its extension during the present session.

The Administration has been giving considerable thought to what recommendations it should make to Congress for its consideration. After weeks of most careful study of this problem, I have concluded that the time is not propitious to recommend any change in the present structure of quotas assigned to foreign countries.

Accordingly, I have recommended to the Congress only certain minimum changes in the present Sugar Act. The most important of these would give me the authority to reduce the quota for a calendar year for any foreign country, except, of course, the Philippines, and to make required replacements from any source when I determine it to be in the national interest or necessary to insure adequate supplies of sugar. I have requested this authority primarily to enable me to protect our sugar consumers should our supplies of sugar from foreign sources be endangered for any reason. The final decision as to whether I am to be given this authority, however, rests with Congress. I regret, therefore, that it has not been possible for me to comply with the wishes of the Philippine sugar producers. I wish to assure you, however, that the position of the Philippines has been given full consideration by the Administration in arriving at the position which I have recommended to Congress.

With assurances of my continued esteem,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

President Garcia to President Eisenhower

MARCH 17, 1960

President DWIGHT EISENHOWER
The White House, Washington

On behalf of the Filipino people, particularly those in the sugar industry, may I ask Your Excellency to increase the Philippine sugar quota by any amount you deem just and fair. May I state in this connection that present production capacity can absorb two hundred thousand tons more of additional quota. Your generous action on this request will give a tremendous boost to our economy which needs further stabilization.

Assuring you of the lasting gratitude of the Filipinos and of my own, I remain

Very sincerely yours,

President CARLOS P. GARCIA

U.S. To Finance Modernization of Airfield in Liberia

Press release 171 dated April 5

The United States, using special assistance funds under the Mutual Security Program, is planning to finance the modernization of Liberia's principal airport, Roberts Field, to accommodate jet traffic which soon will be inaugurated. The project, to be carried out under normal procedures of the International Cooperation Administration, involves reconstruction and lengthening of the Roberts Field runway to 9,000 feet.

The modernization of Roberts Field to accommodate jet traffic was made necessary by the anticipated increase in traffic through the field as well as the introduction of jet service on West African air routes.

Roberts Field was built during World War II by the U.S. Government for use by the United States Ferry Command. Until 1954 the airfield was operated and maintained from U.S. Air Force funds. The field is now being operated as a commercial field by the Liberian Government.

Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy

86th Congress, 2d Session

Greater Cooperation Among Atlantic Democracies. Hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on S. Con. Res. 17. January 19, 1960. 56 pp.

Conditions in the Soviet Union: the "New Class." Hearing before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Further testimony of Aleksandr Y. Kaznacheyev. January 22, 1960. 42 pp.

North American Regional Broadcasting Agreement and the Mexican Broadcasting Agreement. Hearing before the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on S. Ex. A, 82d Congress, 1st session, and S. Ex. G, 85th Congress, 1st session. Part 2. January 24, 1960. 149 pp.

Compulsory Jurisdiction, International Court of Justice. Hearings before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on S. Res. 94, a resolution to amend S. Res. 196, 79th Congress, 2d session, relating to the recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in certain legal disputes. January 27–February 17, 1960. 520 pp.

Communist Leadership: "Tough Guy" Takes Charge. Hearings before the Subcommittee To Investigate the Administration of the Internal Security Act and Other Internal Security Laws of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Testimony by and about Gus Hall. February 2–3, 1960. 93 pp.

Latin America: Venezuela, Brazil, Peru, Bolivia, and Panama. Report of Senator George D. Aiken on a study mission to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. February 2, 1960. 17 pp. [Committee print]

The Eleventh Semiannual Report on Activities Carried on Under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended. Report outlining operations under the act during the period July 1 through December 31, 1959. H. Doc. 335. February 11, 1960. 76 pp.

Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Meeting, Canberra, Australia, 1959. Report of the delegation appointed to attend the meeting, November 6–7, 1959. S. Doc. 83. February 16, 1960. 22 pp.

Mutual Security Act of 1960. Hearings before the House Foreign Affairs Committee on draft legislation to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes. Part 1. February 17–29, 1960. 197 pp.

Special Report of the National Advisory Council on the Proposed International Development Association. Message from the President transmitting the report. H. Doc. 345. February 18, 1960. 50 pp.

National Policy Machinery in Communist China. Report of the Senate Committee on Government Operations made by its Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery. S. Rept. 1096. February 19, 1960. 28 pp.

South America: Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and Venezuela. Report of Senator Wayne Morse on a study mission to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. February 20, 1960. 38 pp. [Committee print]

United Nations Action on Disarmament: A Survey of the Debate and Resolutions of the Fourteenth Session of the General Assembly (September–November 1959). Prepared by the Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. February 22, 1960. 14 pp. [Committee print]

Temporary Tariff Treatment of Chicory. Report to accompany H.R. 9308. H. Rept. 1287. February 22, 1960. 2 pp.

Temporary Suspension of Duty on Certain Shoe Lathes. Report to accompany H.R. 9862. H. Rept. 1288. February 22, 1960. 2 pp.

Organizing for National Security. Hearings before the National Policy Machinery Subcommittee of the Senate Government Operations Committee. Part 1. February 23–25, 1960. 235 pp.

U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO. Report to accompany S. J. Res. 170. S. Rept. 1122. February 23, 1960. 4 pp.

United States Aid Program in Vietnam. Report by the Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Public Affairs to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. February 26, 1960. 60 pp. [Committee print]

Authorizing Service by Canadian Vessels to Southeastern Alaska. Report to accompany S. 2773. S. Rept. 1138. February 26, 1960. 3 pp.

Providing for the Care and Treatment of Returning Nationals of the United States Who Became Mentally Ill in a Foreign Country. Report to accompany S. 2331. S. Rept. 1143. February 27, 1960. 8 pp.

United States–Latin American Relations: Soviet Bloc Latin American Activities and Their Implications for United States Foreign Policy. A study prepared at the request of the Subcommittee on American Republic Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by Corporation for Economic and Industrial Research. No. 7. February 28, 1960. 127 pp. [Committee print]

Authorizing the Acquisition of Land for Donation to the Pan American Health Organization as a Headquarters Site. Report to accompany H.R. 7579. H. Rept. 1300. March 1, 1960. 6 pp.

Report on Audit of the Development Loan Fund for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1959. H. Doc. 350. March 1, 1960. 57 pp.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

Security Council Calls for Adherence to U.N. Principles in South Africa

On March 30 the Security Council adopted on its agenda an item requested by 29 African and Asian delegations urging consideration of the "situation arising out of the large-scale killings of unarmed and peaceful demonstrators against racial discrimination and segregation in the Union of South Africa."¹ Following are two statements made by Henry Cabot Lodge, U.S. Representative, and the text of a resolution adopted on April 1.

STATEMENT OF MARCH 30

U.S./U.N. press release 3375

The United States supported adoption of the agenda and would like to set forth our reasons why.

Our position on this question was expressed clearly in Washington by Secretary of State Herter last Friday.² At that time he stated that the United States favored Security Council discussion of this question. In so doing he pointed out that the United States has followed the same policy on the discussion of *apartheid* in the General Assembly for the last 5 years.³

Since various comments have been made on the question of competence, let me state briefly our view of this matter.

The United States views on the interpretation and application of article 2 (7) of the charter have been clearly established. I myself stated in the discussion of the question of Tibet at the last session of the General Assembly:⁴

¹ U.N. doc. S/4279 and Add. 1.

² BULLETIN of Apr. 11, 1960, p. 551.

³ For a statement made by Harold Riegelman, U.S. Representative, during the 14th session of the General Assembly, see *ibid.*, Dec. 28, 1959, p. 948.

⁴ *Ibid.*, Nov. 9, 1959, p. 684.

In the years since the establishment of the United Nations certain principles and rules concerning the application of article 2, paragraph 7, have emerged. It has become established, for example, that inscription and then discussion of an agenda item do not constitute intervention in matters which lie essentially within domestic jurisdiction.

We hold the same view with respect to the Security Council that we do in the General Assembly.

When a question such as the present one is involved, article 2(7) must be read in the light of articles 55 and 56.

Under articles 55 and 56 of the charter all members of the United Nations have pledged themselves to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion. During the 13th General Assembly the United States Representative in the Special Political Committee, Mr. George Harrison, expressed United States policy on these articles in connection with the *apartheid* discussions on October 16, 1958:⁵

No member of this organization could justifiably seek purposely to escape its pledge. No member could justifiably be excused from endeavoring to fulfill it. We believe that the United Nations can legitimately call attention to policies of member governments which appear to be inconsistent with obligations under the charter and earnestly to ask members to abide by the undertakings that they have accepted in signing the charter.

We all recognize that every nation has the right to regulate its own internal affairs. This is a right acknowledged by article 2, paragraph 7, of the charter. At the same time we must recognize the right—and the obligations—of the United Nations to be concerned with national policies insofar as they affect the world community. This is particularly so in cases where international obligations embodied in the charter are concerned.

⁵ *Ibid.*, Nov. 24, 1958, p. 842.

The United States regrets profoundly the tragic loss of life in South Africa. Twenty-nine member states have brought this situation before the Council, stating that they consider it to have grave potentialities for international friction which endangers the maintenance of international peace and security. What this means is that in their view this situation is not only within the scope of articles 55 and 56 but also of articles 34 and 35. Such widespread concern testifies to the desirability of the Council considering the problem.

Let me say to the members of the Council that the United States approaches this question with no false pride at all. We recognize that many countries, and the United States must be included in that list, cannot be content with the progress which they have made in the field of human rights and that we must continue our efforts as we are doing to provide full equality of opportunity for all of our citizens.

In many countries unsanctioned violations of human rights continue to occur. But we think there is an important distinction between situations where governments are actively promoting human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion and situations where governmental policy runs counter to this.

The question we are asked to consider today has its own particular background of geography, racial composition, cultural diversity, and economic relationships. Even difficulties of this sort do not relieve a government of its obligations, nor can they relieve the United Nations of its responsibilities. We think this question is a proper one for United Nations consideration and therefore supported the adoption of the agenda.

STATEMENT OF APRIL 1

U.S./U.N. press release 3376

On Monday, March 21, in various parts of the Union of South Africa, people of African origin carried out mass demonstrations against laws which require them to carry passes. These demonstrations led to clashes with the police. According to figures made public by the South African mission to the United Nations, at least 68 Africans were killed and over 220 were injured.

The tragic events that day and subsequently have caused shock and distress beyond the borders

of South Africa. Within the Union of South Africa a state of acute tension prevails. All these facts together constitute the immediate and compelling cause of this meeting of the Security Council.

The situation before the Council is of deep concern to the United States. We say this because our primary desire is to help promote within the framework of the charter the objectives of the United Nations.

The framers of the charter took a historic forward step when they included among the purposes of the United Nations the achievement of international cooperation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion. The United States supported wholeheartedly this important innovation in the charter. Its newness and importance as a concept in international life make it essential for all of us to approach sympathetically and constructively the question now before the Security Council.

United States representatives have often stated in General Assembly discussions our belief that the Assembly can properly consider questions of racial discrimination where they are matters of governmental policy. The United States believes that in this case also the charter provides a definite basis for Security Council consideration.

When governmental policies within one country evoke the deep concern of a great part of mankind, they inevitably contribute to tension among nations. This is especially true of racial tensions and the violence which sometimes results. They are more subtle and more complex than some of the political disputes between states which the Council has considered. But in the long run they may be even more destructive to the peace of mankind.

We deeply deplore the loss of life which has taken place in South Africa. We appeal to all the people in South Africa to abjure violence and to proceed hereafter only by peaceful means. Tensions among the people living in South Africa ought to be peacefully relaxed. Violence is deplorable and dangerous no matter from what race or group the victims may come. As we survey the events which are taking place in South Africa, we are confirmed in our view that violence can only make matters worse.

South
1 these
1 com-
security

p con-
because
in the
of the

c for-
purposes
inter-
urag-
mental
e, sex,
s sup-
vation
e as a
al for
l con-
security

stated
f that
ons of
ers of
believes
a defi-

on.

coun-
art of
ension
racial
results.

some
h the
n they
ce of

n has
to all
e and
means.
Africa
s de-
t race
y the
a, we
only

It is clear that the source of the conflict from which the recent tragic events have flowed is the policy of *apartheid* followed by the Government of the Union of South Africa. The United Nations is no stranger to this question. The General Assembly has pronounced itself repeatedly in opposition to the policy of *apartheid* and similar practices. Last year once again the Assembly, by an overwhelming vote, including that of the United States, noted the continuance of the *apartheid* policy in the Union of South Africa and made a solemn appeal for the observance of the human rights provisions of the charter.

In the circumstances confronting us today we appeal once again to the Government of the Union of South Africa, with the greatest sincerity and friendly intent, that it reconsider policies which prevent people of certain races in the Union from enjoying their God-given rights and freedoms. In former years we have made that appeal in the name of justice. Today we make it also in the name of peace. Truly, as we see it here now, the two are in the long run inseparable.

Africa is a continent where all the races mingle together. For the most part they enjoy happy and fruitful relationships. The goal in Africa, as everywhere, must be to end the domination of group by group so that members of all races will feel secure.

We acknowledge that the problem of creating a stable society of diverse racial groups anywhere is difficult. It takes many decades, indeed many generations, to allay anxieties and remove tensions.

But it is not too late, we think, to reverse the tide in South Africa. We are glad to note that the Government of the Union of South Africa has relaxed the enforcement of the pass laws which were the immediate grievance of the demonstrators. We hope other steps are on the way which will lead to a general improvement of the situation.

Now, Mr. President, we confront a draft resolution submitted by the representative of Ecuador which points a constructive way for the Council to proceed. This draft represents a serious and responsible reflection of the views which have been expressed in the Council. It deplores the loss of lives in the recent disturbances in South Africa, and it extends to the many families of the victims the deepest sympathies of the Council. It calls upon the Government of South Africa to initiate measures aimed at bringing about racial harmony based on equality. It also provides that

the Secretary-General through his great skill and resourcefulness should make arrangements which will "help in upholding the purposes and principles of the Charter." This I think is a constructive step. It seeks to build a bridge and not a wall. That is what we should try to do.

The United States will vote for this resolution. We hope the actions of the Council will be taken by those concerned in the spirit in which it is intended—to encourage the peaceful evolution of a society in South Africa in which men of all races can live together in harmony, with mutual respect for the different cultures and ways of life which now exist there.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION*

The Security Council,

Having considered the complaint of 29 Member States contained in document S/4279 and Add. 1 concerning "the situation arising out of the large-scale killings of unarmed and peaceful demonstrators against racial discrimination and segregation in the Union of South Africa",

Recognizing that such a situation has been brought about by the racial policies of the Government of the Union of South Africa and the continued disregard by that Government of the resolutions of the General Assembly calling upon it to revise its policies and bring them into conformity with its obligations and responsibilities under the Charter,

Taking into account the strong feelings and grave concern aroused among Governments and peoples of the world by the happenings in the Union of South Africa,

1. Recognizes that the situation in the Union of South Africa is one that has led to international friction and if continued might endanger international peace and security;

2. Deplores that the recent disturbances in the Union of South Africa should have led to the loss of life of so many Africans and extends to the families of the victims its deepest sympathies;

3. Deplores the policies and actions of the Government of the Union of South Africa which have given rise to the present situation;

4. Calls upon the Government of the Union of South Africa to initiate measures aimed at bringing about racial harmony based on equality in order to ensure that the present situation does not continue or recur and to abandon its policies of apartheid and racial discrimination;

5. Requests the Secretary-General, in consultation with the Government of the Union of South Africa, to make such arrangements as would adequately help in upholding the purposes and principles of the Charter and to report to the Security Council whenever necessary and appropriate.

* U.N. doc. S/4300; adopted on Apr. 1 by a vote of 9 to 0, with 2 abstentions (France, U.K.).

Current U.N. Documents: A Selected Bibliography¹

Economic and Social Council

- United Nations Seminar on Evaluation and Utilization of Population Census Data in Latin America. Preliminary Report of the United Nations Seminar on Evaluation and Utilization of Population Census Data in Latin America, Santiago, Chile, 30 November-18 December 1959. E/CN.9/CONF.1/1. January 27, 1960. 134 pp.
- Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. Activities of the Food and Agriculture Organization of Special Interest to the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. E/CN.11/522. February 1, 1960. 13 pp.
- Commission on Human Rights. Declaration on the Right of Asylum: Comments of Governments. E/CN.4/793/Add. 2. February 5, 1960. 6 pp.
- Economic Commission for Latin America: Committee of the Whole. Progress Report by the Secretariat on the Central American Economic Integration Programme. E/CN.12/AC.45/4. February 8, 1960. 6 pp.
- Economic Commission for Latin America: Committee of the Whole. Information Paper on Technical Assistance Provided to Countries of the ECLA Region Under the Expanded and Regular Programmes. Prepared by the TAB secretariat. E/CN.12/AC.45/5. February 8, 1960. 25 pp.
- Statistical Commission. Proposed Revisions to the International Standards in Basic Industrial Statistics. E/CN.3/257. February 10, 1960. 80 pp.
- Statistical Commission. Proposals for the 1963 World Programme of Basic Industrial Inquiries. E/CN.3/258. February 10, 1960. 29 pp.
- Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. Report of the Committee on Industry and Natural Resources (Twelfth Session) to the Commission (Sixteenth Session). E/CN.11/523. February 15, 1960. 57 pp.
- Economic Commission for Latin America. Progress Report by the Executive Secretary. E/CN.12/AC.45/2. February 8, 1960. 36 pp.
- Economic Commission for Latin America. Note by the Secretariat on Resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Economic and Social Council of Concern to the Commission. E/CN.12/AC.45/10. February 16, 1960. 10 pp.
- Statistical Commission. The Measurement of Gross Domestic Capital Formation in Under-developed Countries. E/CN.3/265. February 16, 1960. 22 pp.
- Economic Development of Under-developed Countries: Work Programme on Industrialization. Progress report and proposals for future works submitted by the Secretary-General. E/3328. February 24, 1960. 17 pp.
- Question of a Declaration on Freedom of Information: Comments of Governments. E/3323/Add. 2. February 25, 1960. 4 pp.
- Statistical Commission. The Statistical Unit in Economic Inquiries. E/CN.3/259. February 25, 1960. 58 pp.
- The Promotion of the International Flow of Private Capital. Progress Report by the Secretary-General. E/3325. February 26, 1960, 96 pp., and Corr. 1, March 7, 1960, 2 pp.
- Commission on the Status of Women. Consent to Marriage, Age of Marriage and Registration of Marriages. E/CN.6/356/Add. 1. March 1, 1960, 46 pp.

¹ Printed materials may be secured in the United States from the International Documents Service, Columbia University Press, 2960 Broadway, New York, N.Y. Other materials (mimeographed or processed documents) may be consulted at certain designated libraries in the United States.

TREATY INFORMATION

U.S. and Rumania Sign Agreement Relating to Financial Questions

Press release 159 dated March 30

DEPARTMENT ANNOUNCEMENT

An agreement relating to outstanding financial questions between the United States and Rumania was signed at Washington on March 30 by Foy D. Kohler, Assistant Secretary of State, representative of the Government of the United States and Radu Manescu, Deputy Minister of Finance, representative of the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic. The negotiations which led to the signing of the agreement began on November 16, 1959.¹

The agreement provides for the settlement on a lump-sum basis of claims of U.S. nationals arising out of war damage, nationalization, and commercial and financial debts as described in articles I and II. The lump-sum settlement of \$24,526,370 includes \$22,026,370 in assets of the Rumanian Government and Rumanian corporations which were blocked in the United States during the war and \$2,500,000 which is to be paid by the Rumanian Government to the United States Government in five installments between July 1, 1960, and July 1, 1964.

The adjudication of certain American claims against Rumania, as provided in Public Law 285, 84th Congress, was completed by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States on August 9, 1959. In accordance with Public Law 285, awards of the Commission have been certified to the U.S. Treasury for payment and certain payments have already been made out of the assets referred to above.

The agreement also provides for the unblocking by the U.S. Government of assets of natural persons residing in Rumania. By an exchange of letters between the heads of the two delegations it was agreed that the transmission to payees in Rumania of U.S. Treasury checks will be resumed.

¹ For background, see BULLETIN of Nov. 23, 1959, p. 764.

AGREEMENT AND EXCHANGE OF LETTERS

Text of Agreement

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE RUMANIAN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC RELATING TO FINANCIAL QUESTIONS BETWEEN THE TWO COUNTRIES

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic having reached an understanding on the financial matters specified herein have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

(1) The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic agree that the lump sum of \$24,526,370, as specified in Article III, will constitute full and final settlement and discharge of the claims described below:

(a) Claims for the restoration of, or payment of compensation for, property, rights and interests of nationals of the United States of America, as specified in Articles 24 and 25 of the Treaty of Peace with Rumania which entered into force on September 15, 1947.

(b) Claims for the nationalization, compulsory liquidation, or other taking, prior to the date of this Agreement of property, rights and interests of nationals of the United States of America in Rumania; and

(c) Claims predicated upon obligations expressed in currency of the United States of America arising out of contractual or other rights acquired by nationals of the United States of America prior to September 1, 1939, and which became payable prior to September 15, 1947.

(2) The term "nationals of the United States of America" as used in subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) above refers to nationals who possessed United States nationality;

(a) for the purpose of subparagraph (a) on both September 12, 1944 and September 15, 1947;

(b) for the purpose of subparagraph (b) on the effective date of nationalization, compulsory liquidation, or other taking;

(c) for the purpose of subparagraph (c) on September 1, 1939.

ARTICLE II

The claims of nationals of the United States of America to which reference is made in paragraph (1) of Article I are those with respect to property, rights and interests covered by subparagraphs (a) and (b) of that paragraph and with respect to obligations covered by subparagraph (c) of the same paragraph which were:

(a) directly owned by individuals who were nationals of the United States of America (for this purpose ownership through a partnership or an unincorporated association being considered direct ownership);

(b) directly owned by a corporation or other legal entity organized under the laws of the United States of America or a constituent state or other political entity thereof, if more than fifty per centum of the outstanding capital stock or other beneficial interest in such legal entity was owned directly or indirectly by natural per-

Trade Relations With Rumania

Department Statement¹

Press release 158 dated March 30

In the course of negotiations between representatives of the Government of the United States and the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic for the conclusion of an agreement concerning financial questions between the two countries, it was mutually agreed that a settlement of these questions would contribute to the development of conditions favorable for increased trade between the two countries.

With the conclusion today of the agreement between the United States of America and the Rumanian People's Republic, relating to financial questions, the two Governments affirm their desire to see an expansion of peaceful trade between the two countries. In this connection the two Governments have agreed to exchange and to disseminate by appropriate means information concerning opportunities for trade between the two countries. They have agreed also to facilitate travel to their countries by commercial representatives and officials of the other country. As conditions permit, the two Governments will give consideration to such additional measures as will contribute to the development of expanded trade relations between the United States and Rumania.

The Governments of the United States of America and the Rumanian People's Republic welcome the possibility of creating through such efforts favorable conditions for the expansion of peaceful trade and the development of more normal trade relations which should also serve as a means of increasing contacts between the peoples of the two countries.

¹ An identical statement was released by the Rumanian Government on Mar. 31.

sons who were nationals of the United States of America; or

(c) indirectly owned by individuals or corporations within subparagraphs (a) or (b) of this Article through interests, totalling twenty-five per centum or more, in a Rumanian legal entity.

ARTICLE III

The sum of \$24,526,370 referred to in Article I of this Agreement shall be made up as follows:

(a) The proceeds resulting from the liquidation of assets in the United States of America which were subject to wartime blocking controls and which belonged to the Rumanian Government and its nationals, other than natural persons, amounting in value to \$22,026,370.

(b) A sum of \$2,500,000 which shall be paid by the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic to the Government of the United States of America in five in-

stallments, each of which shall be in the amount of \$500,000. The first installment shall be paid on July 1, 1960. The four remaining installments shall be paid on July 1, 1961, July 1, 1962, July 1, 1963, and July 1, 1964, respectively.

ARTICLE IV

As from the date of this Agreement, the Government of the United States of America will not pursue or present to the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic claims falling within the categories set forth in paragraph (1) of Article I of this Agreement, without regard to whether the claimants qualify under paragraph (2) of Article I and Article II of this Agreement, or claims predicated upon obligations expressed in other than currency of the United States of America arising out of contractual or other rights acquired and payable prior to the date of this Agreement.

ARTICLE V

The distribution of the lump sum referred to in paragraph (1) of Article I of this Agreement falls within the exclusive competence of the Government of the United States of America in accordance with its legislation, without any responsibility arising for the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic therefrom.

ARTICLE VI

The Government of the United States of America will release within 30 days of the date of this Agreement its blocking controls over all Rumanian property in the United States of America.

ARTICLE VII

The present Agreement shall come into force upon the date of signature.

Done at Washington on March 30, 1960, in duplicate, in the English and Rumanian languages, both texts being equally authentic.

For the Government of the United States of America:

FOY D. KOHLER

For the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic:

R. MĂNESCU

Exchanges of Letters

U.S. LETTER ON INTERPRETATION OF ARTICLE III

WASHINGTON, March 30, 1960

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to the provisions of paragraph (a) of Article III of the Agreement signed on this date. In connection with the discussions that have taken place concerning this Article, I wish to inform you that the Government of the United States of America will inform the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic of the final figure representing the value of the proceeds resulting from the liquidation of assets in the United States of America which were subject to wartime blocking controls and which belonged to the Rumanian Government and its nationals, other than natural persons, when this is determined by the appropriate United

States agencies. It is understood that any possible differences between the figure set out in paragraph (a) of Article III and the final figure furnished by the United States Government will not give rise to or affect any rights or obligations between the two Governments.

I shall appreciate receiving Your Excellency's confirmation of the above understanding.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

FOY D. KOHLER
Chairman

His Excellency

RADU MANESCU,

Chairman, Delegation of the Rumanian People's Republic.

RUMANIAN REPLY

WASHINGTON, March 30, 1960

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of this date which reads as follows:

[text of U.S. letter]

I have the honor to confirm that I fully agree with the understanding expressed above.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

R. MĂNESCU
Chairman

His Excellency

FOY D. KOHLER,

Chairman, Delegation of the United States of America.

RUMANIAN LETTER ON TRANSMISSION OF U.S. TREASURY CHECKS TO RUMANIA

WASHINGTON, March 30, 1960

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to the recent discussions between representatives of the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic and the Government of the United States of America regarding the restriction contained in the regulation of the Government of the United States of America known as Treasury Department Circular 655 concerning the transfer of money from United States public funds to payees in Rumania.

In this connection I wish to inform you that:

(a) The Government of the Rumanian People's Republic places no obstacles or limitations preventing recipients of allowances, social security payments, military pension or other payments by the United States authorities, from holding checks for such payments in accordance with existing regulations of the Rumanian People's Republic and from converting them at the most favorable prevailing rate for remittances to private persons, at present 6 lei to the dollar plus 6 lei representing an exchange premium of 100%.

(b) The Government of the Rumanian People's Republic places no obstacles in the way of beneficiaries in Rumania who may have various claims against United States remitting agencies (such as the Social Security Administration, the Veterans Administration, and any other agencies concerned) furnishing such agencies such information and documentation as may be required by

United States law in connection with these claims and communicating directly or indirectly with respect to these matters with the American authorities concerned.

In accordance with the understanding we have reached, I will appreciate receiving your confirmation that the Government of the United States of America, taking into account the above assurances, agrees to remove the restrictions contained in Treasury Department Circular 655.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

R. MĂNESCU
Chairman

U.S. REPLY

WASHINGTON, March 30, 1960

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of this date which reads as follows:

[text of Rumanian letter]

I hereby confirm that, in view of the assurances contained in your letter, the Government of the United States of America will amend Circular No. 655 issued by the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States of America, so as to remove the restriction on the transfer of money from United States public funds to payees in Rumania.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

FOY D. KOHLER
Chairman

U.S. LETTER ON RUMANIAN DOLLAR BOND OBLIGATIONS

WASHINGTON, March 30, 1960

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to the Agreement signed today between the Governments of the United States of America and the Rumanian People's Republic relating to financial questions between our countries.

The Government of the United States of America has taken note of your proposal to include within this Agreement the dollar bond obligations issued or guaranteed by the Rumanian State, owned by American nationals and payable in the United States of America.

The Government of the United States of America has not been in a position to agree to your proposal, *inter alia*, since it follows the practice of leaving such matters for negotiation between the debtor government and the bondholders or their representatives.

It is my understanding that the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic, by putting forward the proposal mentioned above, has taken note of the outstanding Rumanian dollar bond obligations, and it expresses its intention to settle these obligations with the bondholders or their representatives.

At the same time, I wish to confirm that the Government of the United States of America considers the question of the dollar bond obligations to be separate and distinct from and without effect on the other matters within the scope of the Agreement signed today.

I shall appreciate receiving your Excellency's confirmation of the above understanding.

April 25, 1960

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

FOY D. KOHLER
Chairman

RUMANIAN REPLY

WASHINGTON, March 30, 1960

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your letter of this date which reads as follows:

[text of U.S. letter]

I have the honor to confirm that I fully agree with the understanding expressed above.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my highest consideration.

R. MĂNESCU
Chairman

Current Actions

MULTILATERAL

Aviation

International air services transit agreement. Done at Chicago December 7, 1944. Entered into force for the United States February 8, 1945. 59 Stat. 1693.

Acceptance deposited: Republic of Cameroun, March 30, 1960.

Narcotics

Protocol for limiting and regulating the cultivation of the poppy plant, the production of, international and wholesale trade in, and use of opium. Dated at New York June 23, 1953.¹

Ratification deposited: Union of South Africa, March 9, 1960.

Telecommunications

North American regional broadcasting agreement and final protocol. Signed at Washington November 15, 1950. Enters into force 15 days after the deposit of ratification or adherence by at least three of the following four countries, Canada, Cuba, Mexico, and the United States.

Ratifications deposited: Cuba, February 17, 1953; Canada (with a reservation), April 7, 1957; United States, April 4, 1960.

Entered into force: April 19, 1960.

BILATERAL

Japan

Agreement for a third-country technical assistance training program in Japan. Effectuated by exchange of notes at Tokyo March 23, 1960. Entered into force March 23, 1960.

Netherlands

Agreement relating to a weapons production program. Effectuated by exchange of notes at The Hague March 24, 1960. Entered into force provisionally March 24, 1960. Enters into force definitively on the date the United States is notified that the approval constitutionally required in the Netherlands has been obtained.

¹ Not in force.

New Zealand

Agreement providing for a grant to assist in the acquisition of nuclear research and training equipment and materials. Effectuated by exchange of notes at Wellington March 23, 1960. Entered into force March 23, 1960.

United Arab Republic

Agreement amending the agricultural commodities agreement of December 24, 1958, as amended (TIAS 4147, 4228, and 4333). Effectuated by exchange of notes at Cairo March 26, 1960. Entered into force March 26, 1960.

Agreement supplementing the agricultural commodities agreement of July 29, 1959 (TIAS 4283). Effectuated by exchange of notes at Cairo March 26, 1960. Entered into force March 26, 1960.

Zanzibar

Parcel post agreement and regulations of execution. Signed at Zanzibar October 20 and at Washington December 30, 1959.

Enters into force: May 1, 1960.

PUBLICATIONS

Recent Releases

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. Address requests direct to the Superintendent of Documents, except in the case of free publications, which may be obtained from the Department of State.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities—Purchases for Syrian Pounds. TIAS 4357. 7 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and the United Arab Republic—Signed at Cairo November 14, 1959. Entered into force November 14, 1959. With exchange of notes.

Certificates of Airworthiness for Imported Aircraft. TIAS 4358. 6 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Australia. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington November 20, 1959. Entered into force November 20, 1959.

United States Educational Commission in Sweden. TIAS 4359. 3 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Sweden, amending agreement of November 20, 1952. Exchange of notes—Signed at Stockholm November 20, 1959. Entered into force November 20, 1959.

Sale of Military Equipment, Materials, and Services—Assurances. TIAS 4367. 2 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Liberia. Exchange of notes—Signed at Monrovia April 10 and July 19, 1958. Entered into force July 19, 1958.

Guaranty of Private Investments. TIAS 4368. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and India, supplementing agreement of September 19, 1957. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington December 7, 1959. Entered into force December 7, 1959.

Interchange of Patent Rights and Technical Information for Defense Purposes. TIAS 4380. 15 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany. Exchange of notes—

Signed at Bonn March 9 and May 23, 1959. Entered into force May 26, 1959. With related note—Signed at Bonn July 31, 1959.

Grant for Procurement of Nuclear Research and Training Equipment and Materials. TIAS 4371. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and China. Exchange of notes—Signed at Washington October 16 and December 2, 1959. Entered into force December 2, 1959.

Mutual Defense Assistance—Special Project of Assistance. TIAS 4372. 5 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Turkey. Exchange of notes—Signed at Ankara November 30, 1959. Entered into force November 30, 1959.

Mutual Defense Assistance. TIAS 4373. 4 pp. 5¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Belgium, amending annex B to agreement of January 27, 1950. Exchange of notes—Signed at Brussels October 27 and December 1, 1959. Entered into force December 1, 1959.

Surplus Agricultural Commodities. TIAS 4375. 9 pp. 10¢.

Agreement between the United States of America and Uruguay, supplementing agreement of February 20, 1959, as supplemented. Signed at Montevideo December 1, 1959. Entered into force December 1, 1959. With exchange of notes.

Check List of Department of State Press Releases: April 4-10

Press releases may be obtained from the Office of News, Department of State, Washington 25, D.C.

Releases issued prior to April 4 which appear in this issue of the BULLETIN are Nos. 158 and 159 of March 30 and 166 of April 1.

No.	Date	Subject
167	4/4	Herter: National Association of Broadcasters.
*168	4/4	Cultural exchange (Argentina).
169	4/4	Program for visit of King and Queen of Nepal (rewrite).
170	4/5	Parsons: Cherry Blossom Festival.
171	4/5	Airport improvements in Liberia.
172	4/5	Air transport talks with Philippines.
*173	4/5	Revisions to program for visit of President of Colombia.
*174	4/7	Barrows nominated ambassador to Cameroun (biographic details).
175	4/7	Planning expert goes to Agadir, Morocco (rewrite).
*176	4/7	Revisions to program for visit of President of Colombia.
*177	4/7	Satterthwaite: "Our Role in the Quickening Pace Toward Independence in Africa."
178	4/8	Panama credentials (rewrite).
179	4/8	Herter: news conference.
180	4/8	Reply to Chilean students' letter to President Eisenhower.
*181	4/9	Schedule of foreign ministers meeting.
*182	4/8	Subbottom: "Toward Better Understanding Between the United States and Latin America."

*Not printed.

†Held for a latter issue of the BULLETIN.

American Republics. United States Replies to Chilean Students' Letter to President Eisenhower (Fernández, Howe, Zuniga)	648	Year of Progress Toward Peace (Herter)	635
Atomic Energy. Secretary Herter's News Conference of April 8	641	Nepal. King and Queen of Nepal To Visit United States	640
Aviation. U.S. and Philippines Open Air Transport Negotiations	665	Panama. Letters of Credence (De la Guardia)	658
Chile. United States Replies to Chilean Students' Letter to President Eisenhower (Fernández, Howe, Zuniga)	648	Philippines	
Colombia. Letters of Credence (Sanz de Santamaría)	658	U.S. and Philippine Presidents Exchange Messages on Sugar Quota (Eisenhower, Garcia)	665
Congress, The	666	U.S. and Philippines Open Air Transport Negotiations	665
Congressional Documents Relating to Foreign Policy	659	Presidential Documents	
President Urges Liberalization of Immigration Restrictions	641	President Urges Liberalization of Immigration Restrictions	659
Cuba. Secretary Herter's News Conference of April 8	641	U.S. and Philippine Presidents Exchange Messages on Sugar Quota	665
Disarmament	635	Publications. Recent Releases	674
Secretary Herter's News Conference of April 8	641	Rumania	
Year of Progress Toward Peace (Herter)	648	Trade Relations With Rumania	671
Economic Affairs	665	U.S. and Rumania Sign Agreement Relating to Financial Questions (text of agreement and exchange of letters)	670
Trade Relations With Rumania	670	Science. Secretary Herter's News Conference of April 8	641
U.S. and Philippine Presidents Exchange Messages on Sugar Quota (Eisenhower, Garcia)	671	Treaty Information	
U.S. and Rumania Sign Agreement Relating to Financial Questions (text of agreement and exchange of letters)	671	Current Actions	673
United States Replies to Chilean Students' Letter to President Eisenhower (Fernández, Howe, Zuniga)	665	U.S. and Philippines Open Air Transport Negotiations	665
Germany	670	U.S. and Rumania Sign Agreement Relating to Financial Questions (text of agreement and exchange of letters)	670
Secretary Herter's News Conference of April 8	641	Union of South Africa. Security Council Calls for Adherence to U.N. Principles in South Africa (Lodge, text of resolution)	667
Year of Progress Toward Peace (Herter)	635	United Nations	
Immigration and Naturalization	660	Current U.N. Documents	670
Citizens by Choice (Hanes)	659	Security Council Calls for Adherence to U.N. Principles in South Africa (Lodge, text of resolution)	667
President Urges Liberalization of Immigration Restrictions	664	Name Index	
Japan. Cherry Blossom Festival Highlights U.S.-Japanese Friendship (Parsons)	664	De la Guardia, Erasmo	658
Liberia. U.S. To Finance Modernization of Airfield in Liberia	666	Eisenhower, President	665, 659
Morocco. Harlan Bartholomew To Aid in Agadir Reconstruction	658	Fernández, Patricio	656
Mutual Security	658	Garcia, Carlos P	665
Harlan Bartholomew To Aid in Agadir Reconstruction	666	Hanes, John W., Jr	660
U.S. To Finance Modernization of Airfield in Liberia	666	Herter, Secretary	635, 641



the
Department
of
State

UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
DIVISION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
WASHINGTON 25, D.C.

OFFICIAL BUSINESS

PENALTY FOR PRIVATE USE TO AVOID
PAYMENT OF POSTAGE, \$300
(GPO)

Background of Heads of Government Conference • 1960

Principal Documents • 1955-1959 With Narrative Summary

This volume contains documents of the period 1955 to 1959 covering the principal developments leading to the May 1960 Paris Conference of the Heads of Government of the United States, the United Kingdom, France, and the Soviet Union. A narrative summary, which precedes the documents, refers to the Heads-of-Government meetings held during World War II and reviews briefly the relations between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers in the early postwar years. It deals more fully with those relations for the period beginning with the Geneva Summit Conference of July 1955.

The documents, all of which have been released previously, include diplomatic communications exchanged by the several governments; a number of official declarations and communiqués; various proposals and statements made at the Heads-of-Government Conference of July 1955 and at the Foreign Ministers Conferences of October–November 1955 and May–August 1959; messages exchanged by President Eisenhower and Soviet Chairmen Nikolai Bulganin and Nikita S. Khrushchev; and press statements and addresses of importance made by President Eisenhower, Chairman Khrushchev, Secretaries of State Dulles and Herter, and others.

Publication 6972

\$1.25

Order Form

To: Supt. of Documents
Govt. Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C.

Enclosed find:

\$ _____
(cash, check, or money
order payable to
Supt. of Docs.)

Please send me _____ copies of *Background of Heads of Government Conference • 1960: Principal Documents • 1955-1959, With Narrative Summary*.

Name: _____

Street Address: _____

City, Zone, and State: _____

